

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 16TH AUGUST, 2018

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, K Brooks,
C Campbell, M Gibson, J Heselwood,
A Hutchison, D Ragan, J Shemilt and
P Wray

13 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations.

14 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor S Hamilton.

15 Minutes - 19 July 2018

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2018 be confirmed as a correct record.

16 Application 18/02073/FU - 53 Wickham Street, Beeston, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use of a house (C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (C4).

Subsequent to the publication of the report, it had become apparent that there was a larger number of HMO's in the area than reported. Members were asked to consider deferring the application and should it be recommended for refusal in light of the additional HMOs then the decision be deferred and delegated to officers.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to consider additional information relating to proliferation of HMOs in the area. Should the recommendation be a refusal then this be deferred and delegated to officers for decision and Panel and Ward Members be informed on date of the decision.

17 Application 18/01506/FU - Vaynol Gate, Rooms Lane, Morley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of an existing house, laying out of an access road and construction of four detached houses to garden at Vaynol Gate, Rooms Lane, Morley, Leeds.

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

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

- Site access arrangements.
- Proposed site plan and landscaping arrangements with tree planting and boundary treatments.
- House types and floor plans.
- There was some height increase to existing ridge lines in the area.
- Distances between the properties and existing properties met most of the existing guidelines.
- Overshadowing – diagrams were shown of the worst periods of overshadowing which would occur in March and September. During the summer months all shadows would be contained within the boundaries.
- The application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as outlined in the report and that a further condition be included due to levels at the sight.

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

- There was not an objection to the site being developed but these proposals would be over development.
- The proposals for Plot 3 were over dominant and would restrict the views from existing properties. A bungalow would be more suitable for this plot.
- There would be very little light to neighbouring gardens between October and March.
- The proposed trees to be planted, Apple and Cherry, would grow too high.
- Fencing – it was hoped that new fencing would be installed and the old one removed.

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

- Prior to submission, there had been consultation with neighbouring residents before the final proposals had been finalised.
- There had been a total re-design of the proposals due to concerns regarding over dominance and proximity to the boundaries.
- Plot 3 had been moved which now gave a greater distance for existing properties which was in excess of guidelines. The garage for Plot 2 had also been moved.
- The proposals were compliant with policy and design standards.
- Trees that had recently been removed from the site had been higher and closer to existing properties than the proposed property at Plot 3.

- The site owner had declined an offer for the site which included the development of nine properties as this scheme was felt to suit the area better.
- In response to questions from the Panel, the following was discussed:
 - Garages for Plots 2 and 3. If these could be moved it may remove some of the objections. It was reported that there had already been changes to these following discussions with neighbours. It was felt that the Garage on Plot 2 could be moved but the only solution for Plot 3 would be to reduce the size of the garage.
 - There would be replacement tree planting on the boundary wherever possible and there would be more trees than previously on the site.

Members broadly supported the application although there was still some concern regarding the position of the garages at Plots 2 and 3. It was suggested that the application be approved in principle and deferred and delegated to officers for further negotiation to pull the garages to Plots 2 and 3 away from the boundary to minimise dominance to properties on Rooms Close and to allow for planting between them and the boundary fence.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved in principle and deferred and delegated to officers for further negotiation to pull the garages to Plots 2 and 3 away from the boundary to minimise dominance to properties on Rooms Close and to allow for planting between them and the boundary fencing.

Also ensure a suitable condition regarding before and after levels/internal ground floor levels is added to any approval.

18 Application 18/04396/FU - 56 Shire Road, Morley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a first floor side extension at 56 Shire Road, Morley, Leeds.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and 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:

- A previous application had been refused.
- There was already a single storey extension to the property.
- There was concern regarding the impact on neighbouring properties on Harrop Terrace.
- It was recommended that the application be refused due to the design, over dominance and overshadowing of neighbours.
- It had been suggested that the proposal be altered but the applicant had wished for the application to be considered in its current form.

The applicant addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The application had the support of Local Ward Members who advised to re-submit the application for consideration by Panel.
- With regards to concern of the design, there were other properties of similar design and to set back the first floor extension would be out of keeping with the street scene.
- Concerns of over dominance – the plans met the recommended distances and there had not been concerns from neighbouring properties.
- The applicant had been advised that it was not necessary to provide a diagram to demonstrate overshadowing and that any overshadowing would be reduced due to a change in levels of the neighbouring properties.
- The applicant would be happy to have a hipped roof design which would reduce overshadowing.
- In response to questions from the Panel, the following was discussed:
 - There were no objections from neighbours.
 - The applicant had not felt it necessary to step the first floor extension back as it would look out of place not being flush with the rest of the terrace.
 - The applicant had not provided an overshadowing diagram due to the cost and had been advised that it was not necessary.

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

- Views on whether setting the first floor extension back would make the application more acceptable.
- The lessened effect of shadowing with a setback extension was explained. This reduced the overshadowing and over dominance which were the two main factors for the application being refused.
- The applicant confirmed that they would be willing to participate in further negotiation regarding the design. It was suggested that the application be deferred for approval subject to further negotiation and that the decision be deferred and delegated to officers.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved in principle and deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for further negotiations with the applicant to pull back the first floor of the extension to reduce over dominance and overshadowing.