
Meeting	Area Planning Sub-Committee
Date	4 December 2014
Present	Councillors Watson (Chair), Galvin (Vice-Chair), Douglas, Cuthbertson, Hyman, Fitzpatrick, Looker, McIlveen, Merrett, Richardson (Substitute for Councillor Watt) and Boyce (Substitute for Councillor Gunnell)
Apologies	Councillors Gunnell and Watt

Site	Visited by	Reason for visit
6 Westlands Grove	Councillors Galvin & Watson	As the recommendation was for approval, had been called in by the Ward Member and objections had been received.
Sports Centre, Heslington Lane	Councillors Galvin & Watson	To familiarise Members with the site.

32. Declarations of Interest

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests not included on the Register of Interests that they might have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Cuthbertson declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4b) (Sports Centre, Heslington Lane) as a past student at the University. He clarified that whilst a student he did not use the sports facilities.

Councillor McIlveen also declared a personal interest in the same Agenda Item as he had previously used the facilities at the Sports Centre.

No other interests were declared.

33. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the meetings of the Area Planning Sub Committees held on 8 October and 6 November 2014 be approved and signed by the Chair as correct records.

34. Public Participation

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on general issues within the remit of the Committee.

35. Plans List

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (City Development and Sustainability) relating to the following planning applications outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views of consultees and Officers.

35a) 6 Westlands Grove, York, YO31 1DR (14/01777/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Nigel Travis for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling including alterations to an existing dwelling.

In their update to Members, Officers clarified a mistake at Paragraph 3.7 to the Officer's report. It was reported that the site was not covered by Heworth Without Parish Council and therefore comments, as referred to in the report, would not be expected in relation to the application.

Further to this it was reported that three further objections to the application had been received.

Two objections in relation to revised drawings stated that;

- The amendments were minor and did not address the main issues raised.
- Development was inappropriate on this sensitive corner plot and the proposal should be rejected.
- Major changes were proposed to the existing house to accommodate the proposal, suggesting that the site is too small and the limited separation gap would be out of keeping with the streetscene.

The other objection spoke about how the proposal would result in the loss of important open space, would be out of character and context with the area and contrary to Local Policies GP1 and GP10 and to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Representations were received from a local resident in objection, Mr Bill Woolley. He raised concerns about the loss of open space, the subdivision of the plot and that the dwelling would be located in the front garden not the side garden as stated in the report.

Further representations in objection were received from Alison Rankin who lived in the adjacent property. She expressed concerns regarding overshadowing, loss of light and overdominance. She explained to Members how the proposed dwelling would overshadow her property to the front and rear of her house and that the view from the nearest part of her property to the dwelling would be of a blank wall.

Representations in support of the application were received from Mr Travis the applicant. He confirmed that the garden to the side of the existing plot was not used as amenity space, the hedging to the front and side would be retained and that there would be a nine foot distance between the host property and proposed dwelling. He also added that the proposed dwelling would use existing lines and materials.

During discussion comments were raised about the size of the current garden (which was larger than neighbouring properties) and the proposed garden for the new dwelling, it was suggested that the new garden would be smaller.

Given that the new dwelling would also be located in the front garden it would detract from the streetscene, character of the area which had similar open areas at the front towards the road junctions in the area. It would also be overlooking to other properties. Members felt that this along with demolishing part of the host property constituted overdevelopment and loss of light as the new dwelling would be squeezed on to the existing plot. It was felt therefore that the proposal was contrary to the Council policies on overdevelopment and loss of space.

Resolved: That the application be refused.

Reason: The proposed new dwelling would result in a harmful loss of openness on this prominent corner site which is an important gap within the surrounding development and a characteristic of the locality. This would be detrimental to the character and amenity of the local environment. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework in that it fails to provide a positive improvement in the quality of the built environment and policies GP1c) (Design), GP10 (Subdivision of Gardens and Infill Development) and H4a (Housing Windfalls) of the Development Control Local Plan.

**35b) Sports Centre, Heslington Lane, Heslington, York
(14/02245/FULM)**

Members considered a full major application from the University of York for the erection of an indoor sports hall.

In their update to Members, Officers reported that Heslington Parish Council did not have any objections to the application.

Representations in support were received from the agent, Philip Holmes. He spoke about how the sports hall was currently heavily used by both students and community groups and that there was a clear demand for the new hall. He felt that the visual impact of the new building would not be greater than at present but there would be partial views from Heslington Lane.

In response to a series of questions from Members, Mr Holmes confirmed that the applicant hoped to reuse the materials from the demolished temporary structure and that the materials used for the new building, in particular the coating for the roof repelled mould and mildew and was self cleansing.

During discussion some Members commented on the views and landscaping at the west of the site and on the boundary between Walmgate Stray and the University. They felt that if the application was approved that an additional condition be added to reinforce landscaping to this boundary.

Resolved: That the application be approved with an additional condition regarding tree planting to the western boundary of the campus adjacent to the application site.

Reason: The new building would replace an existing structure of utilitarian design and deteriorating visual appearance. The building would ensure that the existing sports provision for the university and local community will continue to be provided. There are no adverse impacts that would outweigh these benefits. The proposals comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant policies of the Development Control Local Plan.

Councillor B Watson, Chair

[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 3.10 pm].