
MEETING	EAST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
DATE	11 AUGUST 2011
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS WISEMAN (CHAIR), DOUGLAS (VICE-CHAIR) (EXCEPT MINUTE ITEMS 14G-L), KING, FITZPATRICK, FUNNELL, MCILVEEN, WATSON, FIRTH AND WARTERS
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR HYMAN

Site	Attended by	Reason for Visit
The Pupil Support Centre, Danesgate, Fulford Cross, York. YO10 4PB	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	To familiarise Members with the site and because the application had been called in.
Site to the East of Vue Cinema, Stirling Road, York.	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	To familiarise members with the site and because the application had been called in.
Vue Cinema, Stirling Road, York. YO30 4XY	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	To familiarise members with the site and because the application had been called in.
62 Brockfield Park Drive, Huntington, York. YO31 9ER	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	Due to the volume of interest from local residents and because the previous application on this site was also determined by the Committee.
Former Piggeries, Rear of Willow Court, Main Street, Holtby, York.	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	To establish the potential impact that a new housing scheme would have on the Green Belt and also to consider

		the sustainability of the site for residential development.
6 Dairy Farm Court, Main Street, Fulford, York. YO10 4PN	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	To familiarise Members with the site as it had been called in, due to limit space and overdevelopment of the site.
7 Dairy Farm Court, Main Street, Fulford, York. YO10 4PN	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	For the same reasons as the application at 6 Dairy Farm Court
14 New Walk Terrace, York. YO10 4BG	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	As it had been called in by a Ward Member, to enable discussion to take place on the wider context for the installation of solar panels in the City's conservation areas.
14 New Walk Terrace, York. YO10 4BG	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	For the same reasons listed above.

11. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they had in the business on the agenda.

Councillor McIlveen declared a personal non prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 4g) Fantasy World, as a member of York Residential Landlords Association.

No other interests were declared.

12. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the East Area Planning Sub-Committee held on 7 July 2011 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

13. 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.

14. 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.

14a **The Pupil Support Centre, Danesgate, Fulford Cross, York. YO10 4PB (11/01071/GRG3)**

Members considered an application by Adults, Children and Education (City of York Council) for the siting of a temporary mobile classroom unit at the Pupil Support Centre at Fulford Cross School.

Officers confirmed that if Members were minded to approve the application, that planning permission would be granted for a temporary period of three years.

Representations in support of the application were received from the Headteacher of the Support Centre. She informed Members about the aim of the Centre, which was to provide a safe and protective environment for children with behavioural problems. The Headteacher acknowledged that although the likelihood of large scale investment in the construction of new classrooms was slim in the current economic climate, the needs of the children taught at the Centre still needed to be met.

Representations were received from the Ward Member, Councillor D'Agorne. He explained his reasons for calling in the application for consideration by the Committee and stated that he agreed with the Headteacher, in respect of the need for a safe and protective environment for the children taught at the Unit. He referred to the different location of the classroom under consideration in comparison to the previous application. He also informed the Committee that he had witnessed work being undertaken on the proposed site before the consultation period on the application had finished. Finally he felt that parking problems could arise due to the location of the temporary classroom.

Members considered that although temporary buildings, were not an ideal solution, a three year consent would provide an opportunity for alternative funding to be sourced, to allow for a more permanent structure to be considered.

Some Members echoed Councillor D'Agorne's concerns about an increase in parking, particularly on residential streets next to the Unit. The Headteacher responded that no complaints about parking had been received from nearby residents. Other Members suggested that when the classroom is removed from the site, that it be taken down in sections so as not to damage the trees on the site.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to:

- Need for the temporary unit
- Siting
- Highways, Access and Parking
- Sustainability
- Drainage

As such the proposal complies with Policies GP23, ED1 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is reminded that a number of trees to the west and south of the site are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. In this

respect, particular attention is drawn to conditions 2 and 3 of this planning permission. It is also important that when the unit is removed from the site, it is done so in such a way that avoids damage to the protected trees adjacent to the site.

14b Site to the East of Vue Cinema, Stirling Road, York. (11/00620/OUT)

Members considered an outline application from Derby Property Investments Ltd for a 70 bed hotel (use class C1) on the eastern edge of the Vue Cinema car park at Clifton Moor.

Officers clarified to Members that there would be 35 spaces for use by hotel guests on a shared car park. The hotel would be sited on land that was currently used for 79 car parking spaces, and the site would not be fenced off from neighbouring buildings.

Representations in support were received from the applicant's agent. He considered that the hotel could contribute to meeting the needs of accommodation for tourists and business people. He added that analysis of the loss of parking related both to the application under consideration, and the restaurant application which had been withdrawn before the meeting. He felt that the business would be sustainable, as hotel users often decided on their mode of travel before choosing the location of their accommodation.

Representations in objection were received from a member of Rawcliffe Parish Council. He questioned why the traffic survey had been carried out between 8.00 am and 9.00 am and 4.30 pm and 5.30 pm in the month of November, as he felt that these were not the times at which the heaviest traffic flows occurred. He also questioned why the report had stated that trees would have to be removed when there were no existing trees on site. Finally, he felt that the application was contrary to the policies of the Draft Local Plan and should be refused.

Some Members expressed concerns at the loss of car parking spaces, particularly as the existing car park was at present extremely busy. They felt that this would lead to a greater number cars parking on adjacent roads.

Other Members disagreed and felt that the existing car park was often empty and that another hotel in York should be welcomed.

However, as Members felt that the location of the hotel would be unsuitable and that there would be a large loss of parking on the existing site, they agreed with the Officer's recommendation for refusal.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: The application site is defined as being out of the centre which should only be considered appropriate if no suitable sites are available within the city or district centres or on the edge of the centre. It had not been adequately demonstrated that the proposed site is sequentially preferable. Alternative sequentially preferable sites have not been robustly considered. In addition, the applicants have failed to demonstrate that the current under supply of hotel accommodation would not be sufficiently met by existing planning permissions which are in place within the city centre and edge of centre and economically important sustainable mixed use development sites. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not impact adversely on the city centre and edge of centre through reducing the likelihood of existing permissions within more sustainable locations being implemented. Therefore, the proposal is considered unsustainable and contrary to the aims and objectives of national planning advice contained within Planning Policy Statement 4 "Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth" and Policies SP6 and SP7a of the City of York Draft Local Plan.

14c Vue Cinema Stirling Road York YO30 4XY (11/00516/FUL)

This application was deferred to be considered at the next scheduled meeting in September. This was due to the consultation process for the application not being carried out in accordance with Council policy.

**14d 62 Brockfield Park Drive, Huntington, York. YO31 9ER
(11/01473/FUL)**

Members considered a full application from Mr Imam Harman for a change of use from a shop (Class A1) to a hot food takeaway (Class A5) at 62 Brockfield Park Drive.

Officers informed Members about the history of the application, and reported that although the Committee had originally refused a previous application at the same site, a revised application had now been submitted following an appeal decision by the Planning Inspectorate. Officers considered that all of the relevant concerns in relation to odours and noise had now been addressed. The application was brought to Committee for a decision as the previous application had also been determined by the Committee, and due to the level of local interest.

Representations were received from a local resident in objection. She gave a number of reasons in objection to the application including;

- That the repositioning of the flue to below ridge height of the roof would emit smells towards neighbouring properties.
- That daily food preparation would block drains with grease.
- That the glass recycling facility for the takeaway would be noisy.
- That the illuminated signage for the takeaway would cause light pollution.

Representations in support were received from the applicant's agent. He accepted that the extraction fans might make noise, but reported that the noise assessment that had been carried out, was deemed acceptable by Officers. He stated that he considered that the problems that the Planning Inspectorate had identified originally had now been overcome.

Representations were received from the Ward Member, Councillor Runciman. She voiced a number of concerns which included; the possible increase in Anti Social Behaviour, the increase in noise that could be caused by car doors slamming when customers collected takeaway orders and noise and smells particularly during the cleaning up time after closing hours.

In response to a question from a Member on which areas of the original application were deemed unacceptable by the Planning Inspectorate, Officers reported that these related solely to the design and location of the flue extraction system, which had since been amended.

Some Members considered that the application should be refused due to the noise that could be emitted from delivery vehicles, inadequate waste disposal provision and insufficient space at the front of the building for parking.

In response to a suggestion from a Member that deliveries should be restricted, other Members considered that such a service would create less traffic congestion and noise than if individual customers arrived by car to pick up food orders. They added that they wished the opening hours to be from 11.00-22.00 and that a condition requiring grease traps to be fitted be added to any approval, in order to minimise the possibility of drains becoming blocked.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report and the following additional condition;

6. Details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of grease and fat interceptors which shall be installed on all drains. The grease and fat interceptors shall be installed and fully operational prior to the first use of the hot food takeaway and thereafter maintained.

Reason: To ensure the proper treatment of cooking fats to prevent any adverse impact on the surrounding drainage network.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to;

- the impact of the amenities of local residents through noise, odour and litter;
- visual impact on the character and appearance of the area
- traffic and car parking; and
- anti-social behaviour

As such the proposal complies with Policies S6 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

14e Former Piggeries, Rear Of Willow Court, Main Street, Holtby, York. (11/00585/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr C England for the erection of four dwellings with associated garages and access following the demolition of existing farm buildings.

In their update to Members, Officers gave a brief summary of the history of planning applications on the site under consideration. They stated that since the Officer's report had been written, further investigations had been carried out in relation to the proposed footpath from the site into the village, and how it would link up with other improvement works proposed by CYC. The applicant had indicated that he was prepared to fund the cost of the works. It was noted that further work had also taken place in relation to the existence of Great Crested Newts adjacent to the site, and that the open space offered by the applicant would need to be maintained as a nature reserve rather than as general amenity land. It was reported that the applicant was happy for the land to be used as a nature reserve to provide a habitat for the newts, if the application was approved.

Officers reported that a condition could be added to planning permission for a detailed management plan and that a licence would need to be acquired from Natural England before any construction commenced on the site.

In response to Members' queries about a previous application on the same site, Officers reported that the current proposal included fewer houses, and that the houses would be significantly higher than the tallest barn on the site.

Representations in objection to the application were received from a local resident. He felt that national planning advice in PPG2 relating to the Green Belt, had not been followed, in that it stated in paragraph 2.6 that development should not be allowed merely because a site has become derelict.

Representations in support of the application were received from another local resident. He considered that the proposed development was appropriate because the agricultural buildings on the site would be difficult to convert into open market residential units. He felt that these buildings were dangerous to children and were home to rats. He also felt by allowing development to take place, those properties which were located next to the site but away from the village, would feel more integrated into the village.

Representations in support were received from the applicant. He told Members that since 2005, decisions had been taken that housing was the only viable development on the site. He felt that the application should be approved, because it would provide work for those in the demolition and construction industry.

In response to a question from Members as to why the applicant wanted to develop the site, the applicant responded that the business for intensive livestock farming was not sustainable without a large amount of arable land available.

Representations were received from a member of Holtby Parish Council. He stated that the majority of residents were in support of the proposal and supported the provision of a footpath from the site into the village.

During their discussion Members commented on the height of the proposed buildings, but felt that four dwellings would be more preferable than the previous application for eight properties. It was also considered that although the dwellings might intrude into the Green Belt, they would not restrict views for other residents in the village.

Officers advised Members that if they were minded to approve the application, it would need to be referred to Government Office in order for them to determine whether the application should be "called in" for a decision by a Government Inspector, as approval of the application would be contrary to Green Belt policy.

Members suggested that a number of conditions be added to planning permission, if the application was approved, including;

- Standard “time” and “plans” conditions
- The removal of permitted development rights in order to control future extensions to the dwellings
- Materials to be agreed
- A maximum height for the dwellings
- Creation and future management of the Great Crested Newt habitat
- Highway conditions relating to surfacing details, access details, car and cycle parking, turning areas, no mud on the highway during construction, and a dilapidation survey.
- Drainage details to be agreed
- Ground contamination remediation strategy
- Conditions as recommended by the Internal Drainage Board and Yorkshire Water in relation to foul and surface water disposal
- Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 to be achieved
- 5% of total energy requirements to be provided from on site renewable sources

In addition, that a Section 106 Agreement be entered into relating to the following:

- Financial contribution of £180,000 towards footpath and junction improvements
- An affordable housing contribution of £46,282. 50
- Transfer of land to the Parish Council including future maintenance requirements and funding arrangements
- Public open space contribution of £13,008

RESOLVED: That the application be referred to Government Office with an indication that Members are minded to approve the application subject to the conditions and undertakings referred to above.

REASON: Members consider that there are very special circumstances that outweigh any harm to the Green Belt that may otherwise arise.

14f 19 Bramley Garth, York. YO31 0NQ (11/00927/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mrs Susan Hodgson for a replacement conservatory roof and rear wall at 19 Bramley Garth.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on the living conditions of neighbours and flood risk. As such, the proposal complies with Policies GP1, GP15a 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.

14g Fantasy World, 25 Main Street, Fulford, York. YO10 4PJ (11/00523/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Justin Heaven for the conversion of a shop to 9 bedroom house in multiple occupation at Fantasy World, 25 Main Street, Fulford.

Representations in support were received from the applicant. He outlined his reasons for applying for permission to change the use from a shop to a 9 bedroomed house, and why he felt that Members should approve the application. The reasons were as follows;

- The desire to keep the property in the ownership of the applicant's family rather than sell it.
- That a House in Multiple Occupation(HMO) could allow for the applicant to continue to live in the building, whilst renting out other rooms.
- That parking demand for a retail building was greater than that of than the proposed use of the building.
- That the installation of new glazing would decrease the noise level that could be faced by prospective residents.

- That the continued use of the premises as a shop would not be commercially viable, particularly given the loss of businesses in the vicinity.

Representations were received from a representative of Fulford Parish Council. They objected to the application due to; the loss of a longstanding business, the loss of off street parking which might lead to further on street parking, the impact on the Conservation Area of two HMOs in the vicinity and the narrow access to the property.

Further representations were also received from the Ward Member, Councillor Aspden. He stated that the community regretted the loss of business from Fulford, and considered that the proposed use would cause parking problems. He questioned why only two parking spaces had been proposed for nine residents, and questioned the safety of a doorway opening on to a narrow access point.

During their discussion Members noted that there were significant parking issues that needed to be addressed and that they were concerned that the narrow access would restrict the passage of emergency vehicles into the building.

Officers commented that in their view the proposed use was unlikely to generate significant parking problems over and above the existing retail use, and pointed out that the site was on a bus route with good cycling access to other parts of the city. They added that the access to the rear of the site was 2.2 metres wide, which was deemed as adequate under highway guidelines.

Some Members felt that the application should be refused due to unsafe access, inadequate parking provision and a concentration of HMOs in the area.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: (i) It is considered that the proposal incorporates insufficient off street parking to cater for the proposed use, resulting in the likelihood of vehicles being parked on the highway to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and highway safety, in conflict with Policy H8

("Conversions") of the City of York Draft Local Plan.

- (ii) It is considered that the width of the vehicular access to the site is insufficient to safely accommodate the intensification of use which would be likely to result from the proposal, particularly in association with the use of the adjacent property as a House in Multiple Occupation, resulting in conflict between pedestrians and vehicles attempting to enter and leave the application site.
- (iii) It is considered that the cumulative impact of the proposal, taken together with the existing House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) at 23 Main Street, would result in an overintensification of HMO's in the area to the detriment of the character of the area and the amenity of adjacent occupiers as a result of increased levels of activity, noise and disturbance. Thus the proposal would conflict with Policy H8 ("Conversions") of the City of York Draft Local Plan

14h 25 Derwent Road, York. YO10 4HQ (11/01547/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Andy Wilcox for a two storey extension.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to residential amenity and the impact on 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).

**14i 6 Dairy Farm Court, Main Street, Fulford, York. YO10 4PN
(11/00993/FUL)**

Members considered a full application from Mr Derek Binns for a single storey side extension (revised scheme) at 6 Dairy Farm Court.

In their update to Members, Officers confirmed that the tree which would be removed did not form part of an approved landscaping scheme and was not deemed worthy of a Tree Preservation Order. Officers confirmed the view of a number of appeal decisions, which had concluded that if a development was not visible to the public, it was considered to be less likely to detrimentally affect the visual amenity of the Conservation Area.

Representations in objection were received from a representative of Fulford Parish. He considered that the application was overdevelopment of a restricted area. He added that there was a lack of amenity space, as the proposed extension would leave a very small amount of garden space. He disagreed with the Officer's comment that the extension would not affect the Conservation Area simply because it was not visible, because he considered that the effects should take into account the impact on the Conservation Area as a whole.

Representations were received from the Ward Member Councillor Aspden. He pointed out that Officers had recently refused an application on the site under delegated powers because it was felt to be overdevelopment on a restrictive site, and that it would have an oppressive nature on adjacent properties. He echoed the comments of the Parish Council in their concern of a lack of amenity space and also added that there was currently limited parking.

Members asked how the application under consideration differed to the one that was refused previously.

Officers responded that the previous application was for a two storey extension with a larger footprint, and that the remaining amenity space at the front of the property was considered to be sufficient.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to occupants of the neighbouring properties. Nor is it considered that the size, scale or design of the extension would have any detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, the proposal complies with policies H7, GP1 and HE3 of the City of York Draft Local Plan and with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance to "Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses".

14j 7 Dairy Farm Court, Main Street, Fulford, York. YO10 4PN (11/00925/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Derek Binns for a single storey side extension at 7 Dairy Farm Court.

This application was considered at the same time as the application at 6 Dairy Farm Court. All details of any discussion that took place on this item are listed under the previous minute item.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to occupants of the neighbouring properties. Nor is it considered that the size, scale or design of the extension would have any detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, the proposal complies with policies H7, GP1 and HE3 of the City of York Draft Local Plan and with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance to "Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses".

14k 14 New Walk Terrace, York. YO10 4BG (11/01296/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr and Mrs Scott for the installation of solar panels on the rear roof slope of 14 New Walk Terrace.

In their update to Members, Officers referred to the statutory duty of the Council to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building or its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. They also referred to national planning advice which stated that where conflict between climate change objectives and the conservation of heritage assets is unavoidable, the public benefit of mitigating the effects of climate change should be weighed against the harm to the significance of the heritage asset. In other words, a balancing exercise needed to be carried out. Officers also informed Members that a reference in their report which related to the applicant making a formal approach to the Civic Trust needed to be amended to an “informal approach.”

Officers were asked if there were any other roofs with solar panels in the vicinity and how solar panels differed from rooflights. They responded that there were no roofs with solar panels in the area and that the panels had a shinier surface than rooflights.

Representations were received in support from the applicant. He did not believe that the proposal would harm the Conservation Area. He believed that velux windows did a greater amount of damage to the fabric of a listed building than the installation of solar panels on the roof. Finally he stated that the only prominent view of the solar panels would be from the rear of the property.

Representations in support were received from the Ward Member, Councillor Taylor. He considered that in general there was insufficient policy guidance in relation to the use of new technologies in cases such as this. He also stated that he felt the roof slope of the property was not prominent, and that the visual intrusion was very small when compared with other alterations and extensions in the vicinity. He added that the applicants were happy for conditions to be added to planning permission, and that they would be happy for their scheme to be used as a pilot for others.

Members asked the applicant if the solar panels could be removed and asked in what situation they could be removed. The applicant responded that the panels could be removed as they were clipped together, on a lightweight frame and were not permanently attached to the roof. In addition, the applicant stated that if a subsequent owner wished to remove them or they became degraded, they could be removed.

In response to a question from Members, Officers explained that the recommendation for refusal had been influenced by comments received from the Council's Conservation Team, as the panels would cover a significant area of the roof and would be harmful to the appearance of the building. Officers also commented that if the application was approved it would be difficult for other similar applications to be refused, due to the property forming part of a longer terrace of listed buildings and because a precedent would have been set.

Members considered that a Council policy needed to be formulated on the issue of renewable energy sources in Conservation Areas as other similar applications could be considered by the Committee in the future. Some Members considered that the application could be deferred to be considered at a later date, following the formulation of a policy. Other Members felt that they did not believe the application to be detrimental to the area, as the panels might not necessarily be a permanent structure, and that there was a need to keep up with current progress in new technologies.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved with the following conditions;

- (i) The development shall be begun no later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To ensure compliance with Sections 91 to 93 and Section 56 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and other submitted details;

Submitted drawings and supporting information received 23.05.11.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the following conditions listed above, 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. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and HE3 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

14I 14 New Walk Terrace, York. YO10 4BG (11/01298/LBC)

Members considered a listed building consent application from Mr and Mrs Scott for the installation of solar panels on the rear roof slope of 14 New Walk Terrace.

This application was considered at the same time as the full application at the same address. All details of any discussion that took place on this item are listed under the previous minute item.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved with the following conditions;

- (iii) The development shall be begun no later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To ensure compliance with Sections 91 to 93 and Section 56 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section

51 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (iv) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and other submitted details;

Submitted drawings and supporting information received 23.05.11.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the following conditions listed above, 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. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and HE3 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

Cllr S Wiseman, Chair
[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 5.10 pm].