| City of York Council | Committee Minutes |
|---|---|
| MEETING | WEST & CITY CENTRE AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE |
| DATE | 14 JUNE 2012 |
| PRESENT | COUNCILLORS WATSON (CHAIR), GALVIN, JEFFRIES, LOOKER, ORRELL, SEMLYEN, WILLIAMS (AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR CLLR FUNNELL) AND RICHARDSON (AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR CLLR GILLIES) |
| APOLOGIES | COUNCILLORS FUNNELL, GILLIES AND REID |

## 1. INSPECTION OF SITES

The following sites were inspected before the meeting.

| Site | Attended by | Reason for Visit |
|---|---|---|
| Springfield Farm, Appleton Road, Bishopthorpe | Councillors Galvin, Jeffries, Richardson, Semlyen and Watson. | As objections has been received and the officer recommendation was to approve. |
| 34 St Marys | Councillors Galvin, Jeffries, Looker, Richardson, Semlyen and Watson. | At the request of Councillor Gillies. |

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting, members were invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Galvin declared a personal non prejudicial interest in plans item 4d (Springfield Farm, Appleton Road, Bishopthorpe) as a resident had spoken to him regarding the application but he confirmed that he had not expressed a view on the application.

Councillor Jeffries also declared a personal non prejudicial interest in plans item 4d (Springfield Farm, Appleton Road, Bishopthorpe) as the applicant's son was a friend of hers.

## 3. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the West and City Centre Area Planning Sub-Committee held on 19 April 2012 be approved and signed by the chair as a correct record.

## 4. 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 Sub-Committee.

## 5. PLANS LIST

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development), relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views and advice of consultees and officers.

## 5a 34 Cranbrook Road, York, YO26 5JA (12/01424/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr G Peters for a single storey front and side extension.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbours or the impact upon the streetscene. As such the proposal complies with Policies H7 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and

City of York Supplementary Planning Guidance to Householders (Approved March 2001).

**5b 9 Cranbrook Road, York, YO26 5JB (12/01836/FUL)**

Members considered a full application from Mr Rob Graham for a two storey side, single storey rear extension and porch to the front.

RESOLVED: That delegated authority be given to officers to approve the application in consultation with the chair and vice-chair of the sub-committee following the end of the consultation period (15 June 2012).

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the effect on residential amenity and the impact on the streetscene. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

**5c 34 St Marys, York, YO30 7DD (12/01006/FUL)**

Members considered a full application for alterations to the garage to form a room in the roof.

Officers advised members that their recommendation to refuse the application was due to the impact of the increased height and massing on both the conservation area and on the living conditions of the neighbouring property as a result of loss of outlook.

The Conservation Architect confirmed that at present, the garage sits quite low on the site which preserves the openness of the area behind the houses across the railway line to the tree cover which is important to the character of the street. However

this application to increase the height of the garage would change this.

Representations were received from a neighbour in objection to the application. He circulated a set of photographs of the garage for Members information. He explained that the garage had been allowed as an exception as the impact on the street scene was reduced due to its height, however these proposals would lead to a considerable increase in both height and size. This would lead to the neighbour at no 35 having to look out onto a large blank wall and the garage would become a large presence in the garden. He agreed that it would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Representations were also received from the applicant in support of the application. He pointed out that the increase in height was less than 5ft stating this would not harm the setting nor the view from the street to the railway line. He advised Members that care had been taken with the design of garage to maintain the relationship with host dwelling, the gable feature of the garage reflecting that of the main house. He explained that he was a publisher and needed the extra space above the garage for storage of books, as there was no longer sufficient space in the house to store them and they were currently in a storage facility which caused problems for access.

Members acknowledged officers concerns regarding the increased height and mass of the building and its impact on neighbours and the conservation area, particularly the possible loss of views from St Marys across the railway line and beyond and noted that some loss of view has already occurred due to other development which has taken place on the street.

Members asked whether it would be practical to condition limiting the use of the additional first floor to storage but having taken advice from planning officers, agreed that the use of the garage extension for any purpose incidental to the use of the house was acceptable and a condition was not necessary.

Members expressed the view that it was an admirable scheme which would enhance the look of the house. Members concluded that the proposed changes would not significantly harm either the conservation area or the neighbour’s amenity.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved and delegation be given to officers to agree the conditions in consultation with the chair and vice chair of the sub-committee.

REASON: The proposal, subject to conditions agreed, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and the living conditions of the adjacent property. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and HE2 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

**5d Springfield Farm, Appleton Road, Bishopthorpe, York, YO23 2XA (12/01117/FUL)**

Members considered a full application from Mr R J Edmondson for the erection of a 15 metre (to hub) high wind turbine (resubmission).

Officers clarified that any references to “Proven” within the appraisal should be replaced by “Kingspan KW6 turbine”, which was the new name for the Proven turbine which had been proposed in the previous application.

Officers advised that a further representation had been received from a previous objector stating that the Proven and Kingspan KW6 were not the same and the Proven model had a cut off device for higher wind speeds, whereas the Kingspan does not. It asked that, if the application is approved they would like confirmation that the noise levels would be monitored, and action taken to ensure the readings are not above the background level outside the dwellings.

Officers also advised the Committee of the consultation response which had been received from the Ecology Officer. In response to residents observations of a large flock of starlings in the area, the Ecology Officer advised that the location of the turbine in the centre of the field was not thought to be within any major migratory routes and taking into account the proposed location, surrounding area and size of turbine, it was not

considered that any further information or survey work is required as part of this application.

With regard to bats, the Ecology Officer confirmed that the turbine was not close to any potential roosting sites, commuting corridors, mature trees and other areas of good foraging habitat. Furthermore there were no known/recorded bat roosts within close proximity.

The Ecology Officer acknowledged that, whilst individually, this proposed turbine and the other small turbine on adjacent land at Park Farm, were considered unlikely to have any significant impact on local wildlife, there was a potential for a cumulative impact, and if additional turbines were proposed within the area in the future, then these issues would need to be taken into account and further survey information may be required.

Members took account of the noise survey submitted with the application and agreed that it was unlikely that noise from the turbine would be an issue. Members also agreed that the trees in the area would limit the visual impact of the turbine from Temple Lane.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference the residential amenity of the neighbours, the visual amenity of the locality and the greenbelt. As such, the proposal complies with Policies GP1, GB1, and GP5 of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan (2005); national planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and "Planning for Renewable Energy - A Companion Guide to PPS22".

Councillor B Watson, Chair
[The meeting started at 3.00 pm and finished at 4.00 pm].