

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 21ST MARCH, 2019**

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

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

The following Members attended site visits prior to the meeting – Councillors C Gruen, K Brooks, S Hamilton, D Ragan, P Wray, B Anderson, C Campbell, J Heselwood and A Hutchison

### **69 Late Items**

The following late item was admitted to the agenda:

- Application 18/03843/OT – Outline application for a new dwelling, 18 Church Lane, Tingley, WF3 1BQ

### **70 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations.

### **71 Minutes - 21 February 2019**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2019 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the following:

- Councillor K Brooks attendance on Site Visits.
- Minute No 99 – Application 17/07108/FU – Unit 8 Ashfield Works, Westgate Otley. Concerns regarding parking for the care home and that staff should not be forced to pay for parking. This issue to be resolved by the applicant.

### **72 Application 18/03007/FU - Masham Court, Shaw Lane, Headingley**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for one dwelling with a detached garage at Masham Court, Shaw Lane, Headingley.

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

Issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The application was for a single brick built four bedroom dwelling with a detached garage.

- An objection had been received from a local Ward Councillor due to the impact that the proposals would have on the conservation area.
- The vacant site was in a predominantly residential area of Far Headingley with stone terraced housing to the north and a 1960s residential scheme to the rear.
- The site was within the Far Headingley Conservation Area which was characterised by stone and brick properties.
- There would be green roofs to the garage and single storey element of the dwelling.
- Vehicle access arrangements were shown.
- There had been a solar analysis which showed there would be small increases in shadowing at certain times of the year.
- The Panel was asked to consider the design and use of materials within the setting of the conservation area and the impact on the terraced houses at Albert Grove.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- It was a surprise to see proposals for a brick building. The neighbourhood design stated materials should match those of original architecture.
- Masham Court was surrounded by stone buildings.
- The proposed building was too high and half a storey higher than Masham Court.
- It was acknowledged that the proposals would cause overshadowing and the building should only be two storey.
- The site was used for parking as part of the conditions when Masham Court was built. There had not been a change of use for this land and building should not take place.
- The land should not be made available for development until replacement parking spaces had been found.

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

- It would be possible to use stone materials.
- The eaves height was in line with that of Masham Court.
- The overshadowing would be only at lower levels for short periods during winter months.
- The site had not been used for car parking for several years.

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

- The wall between the proposed dwelling and the terraces at Albert Grove would be strengthened and supported by the applicant. Ownership of the wall was discussed. It was reported that the

applicants would be responsible for works to strengthen the wall and existing arrangements would continue regarding maintenance on the other side facing the properties on Albert Grove.

- There had previously been a condition for car parking on the land but that had lapsed. The garages on the site were demolished following the grant of permission in 2017.
- The proposals for a brick design had been decided following discussions with design and conservation officers.
- Due to the contemporary design of the building it was not felt that stone would be appropriate and it was not felt that the design contradicted the Far Headingley Conservation Area.
- There was on street parking in the immediate area but in places where the road was wide enough to accommodate this. Restrictions on parking were in place where they were needed.
- Some concern with regards to the massing and height of the proposed dwelling was expressed.

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

### **73 Application 18/03842/OT - 18 Church Lane, Tingley, Wakefield**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an outline application for a dwelling at 18 Church Lane, Tingley.

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

Issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The application had been recommended for refusal and had been referred to Panel at the request of a Local Ward Councillor.
- The site was on an unadopted road and formed part of the garden space for 18 Church Lane.
- A new access into the site was proposed.
- Approximately 20 houses were currently served by the unadopted road.
- Reasons for refusal included the serving of more than 5 houses off a private and unadopted road the visibility splays to Syke Road and Baghill Road.
- The most recent property built had been done under previous planning legislation.

- There had been objections from local residents due to the loss of garden space, over development, the poor condition of the private road and an increase in traffic.
- Further representations were made by the Highways Officer. These included the following:
  - Current standards required 4.8 metre carriageway and a 2 metre footway. Church Lane was on average 4.2 metres wide with a very narrow footway. Visitors parked on the street blocking the footway and there was no turning head at the end of the road.
  - Visibility splays out to Syke Road and Baghill Road were below the suggested recommendation of 25 metres.
  - Traffic speed on Syke Road/Baghill Road had been recorded at an average of over 30 miles per hour.
  - It was felt the condition of the road was so sub-standard that further development should be resisted.

The applicant addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The land had previously been in the ownership of the applicant's family.
- The applicant understood the objections that had been submitted but felt that the impact of one extra house would be negligible on traffic.
- The speed on the adjoining roads had been reduced to twenty miles per hour.
- All houses on the street had their own parking spaces. Double yellow lines could be introduced to prevent on street parking.
- The application was supported by a local Ward Councillor who was a frequent user of Church Lane and felt the impact would be negligible.

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

- There was nothing to support or justify the reasons of the applicant.
- The road was in a poor state and deteriorating with potholes.
- Cars parked at the corner shop by Sykes Road made access dangerous.
- Damage to resident's vehicles caused by vehicles and delivery vehicles.
- High volumes of pedestrians particularly with school children having to use the road due to parked cars.
- The officer reasons for refusal were fair, reasonable and in line with policy.

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

- The site did not include the garages.
- Yellow lines at the junction would still not make a difference to the visibility splay.
- Concerns regarding the visibility to Syke Road and Baghill Road.
- Concern that approval would be against policy.

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

**74 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday, 25<sup>th</sup> April 2019