
MEETING	WEST & CITY CENTRE AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
DATE	17 JUNE 2010
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS HORTON (CHAIR), CRISP, STEVE GALLOWAY, GALVIN, GILLIES, SUNDERLAND, MORLEY, MOORE (AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR CLLR REID) AND SIMPSON-LAING (AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR CLLR B WATSON)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS REID AND B WATSON

1. INSPECTION OF SITES

The following sites were inspected before the meeting.

Site	Attended by	Reason for Visit
Bentham Lodge, 92 Tadcaster Road	Councillors Crisp, Galvin, Gillies, Horton, and Moore.	At the request of Cllr Reid.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Morley declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Plans Items 4d and e (Penleys House, 59A Monkgate) as he is the applicant for both applications.

Councillor Steve Galloway declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Plans Item 4d and e (Penleys House, 59A Monkgate) as he knows the applicant, a fellow elected Member, on a personal basis.

Councillor Moore declared a personal interest in Plans Item 4d and e (Penleys House, 59A Monkgate) as the applicant is an elected Member.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the West and City Centre Area Planning Sub Committee held on 13 May 2010 be approved and signed as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were 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 Bentham Lodge, 92 Tadcaster Road, Dringhouses, York, YO24 1LT (10/00450/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Patrick Logan for a detached single storey dwelling to the rear of 92 Tadcaster Road.

Officers advised the Committee that the address of the development had now been altered to "Land adjacent to 92 Tadcaster Road". They stated that a letter of support had been received from the occupant of 92 Tadcaster Road which put forward several points in support of the application (*this document has been appended to the agenda papers*).

Representations were received from a resident in objection to the application. He raised concerns over the potential noise and inconvenience neighbours would be subjected to during construction and queried how deliveries would be made to the site without causing obstruction. He also expressed disappointment that several trees had previously been removed from the owner's land and made reference to covenants on the land.

Representations were also received from the applicant in support of the application. He addressed concerns raised in the report and by the first speaker with regard to size of plot and issues surrounding drainage and covenants. He explained that his intention was to provide a family home for his wife and daughter, advised that the trees had been removed from the land prior to him purchasing it and that the pitch of the roof was too low and roof space too limited to make future installation of dormer windows possible.

Some Members expressed the view that the proposed building would be a tight fit on the plot with insufficient amenity space and Councillor Moore moved and Councillor Sunderland seconded a motion to refuse the application. On being put to the vote, the motion was lost.

Members agreed that the site was larger than some housing plots on neighbouring streets and that subdivision of terraced houses with no amenity space have been permitted in the past. However they voiced concerns that insufficient drainage details had been submitted and officers

advised that on smaller sites it was important that full drainage details are submitted before a decision is taken.

RESOLVED:

That delegated authority be given to officers to approve the application once foul and surface water details have been received and resolved by the planning department.

REASON:.

The Sub Committee considered that the proposal, subject to foul and surface water drainage details being resolved, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the character and appearance of the area and adjacent conservation area, highway safety and residential amenity. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, H4A and GP10 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

5b 20 Weddall Close, York, YO24 1EG (10/00561/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Ian Goater for a rear conservatory.

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 appearance of the dwelling and residential amenity. 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 32 Thorpe Street, York, YO23 1NL (10/00736/FUL)

Members considered a full application by Mr and Mrs Harrison for a single storey rear 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 appearance of the dwelling and residential amenity. 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.

5d Penleys House, 59A Monkgate, York (10/00579/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Jonathan Morley for the change of use from offices to two flats (use Class C3) with estate agents office at part ground floor, the erection of a single storey extension to rear and new wall and gates following demolition of existing garage.

Officers drew Members' attention to paragraph 3.5 of the report which referred to a letter from a local resident noting that Respark Zone R8 was already heavily oversubscribed. They also noted that Highways had taken this into account but considered that a recommendation of refusal based on the lack of vehicle parking for the one bedroom flat could not be substantiated due to the proximity of the city centre and public transport links. Members accepted the issue of parking but agreed that the proposed development would enhance the area.

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 supply of employment accommodation in the City
- impact of proposed changes on the character and appearance of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area,
- the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents.

As such the proposal complies with Policies HE2, HE3, E3b, L1c, H4a and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

5e Penleys House, 59A Monkgate, York (10/00582/CAC)

Members considered an application for Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of a garage. The application was associated with the previous application for change of use of the building from offices to 2 residential units and a single storey extension and alterations to the boundary treatment (planning reference 10/00579/FUL – minute 4d refers)

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

REASON: The proposal would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the character and appearance of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area. As such the proposal

complies with Policy HE5 of the City of York
Development Control Local Plan

Councillor D Horton, Chair

[The meeting started at 3.00 pm and finished at 3.30 pm].