



Notice of meeting of

West & City Centre Area Planning Sub-Committee

To: Councillors Horton (Chair), Reid (Vice-Chair), Crisp, Steve Galloway, Galvin, Gillies, Sunderland, B Watson and Morley

Date: Wednesday, 15 December 2010

Time: 3.00pm

Venue: The Guildhall, York

AGENDA

There will be no site visits in respect of this meeting.

1. Declarations of Interest

At this point Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on this agenda.

2. Public Participation

It is at this point in the meeting that members of the public who have registered their wish to speak can do so. The deadline for registering is by **5pm** the working day before the meeting, in this case **5:00pm on Tuesday 14 December 2010**. Members of the public can speak on specific planning applications or on other agenda items or matters within the remit of the committee.

To register please contact the Democracy Officer for the meeting, on the details at the foot of this agenda.

3. Plans List

To determine the following planning applications related to the West and City Centre Area.

a) **Bright Street Post Office, 37 Stamford Street East, York, YO26 4YE (10/02360/FUL)** (Pages 3 - 10)

Conversion and alterations of existing post office and dwelling to create 2 dwellings [*Holgate Ward*]

4. **Appeals Performance Report** (Pages 11 - 30)

This report (presented to both Sub Committees and Main Planning Committee) informs Members of the Council's performance in relation to appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate in the 3-month period up to 31st October 2010, and provides a summary of the salient points from appeals determined in that period. A list of outstanding appeals as at 31st October 2010 is also included.

5. **Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972**

Democracy Officers:

Name: Catherine Clarke and Louise Cook (job share)

Contact Details:

- Telephone – (01904) 551031
- E-mail – catherine.clarke@york.gov.uk and louise.cook@york.gov.uk

(If contacting us by e-mail, please send to both democracy officers named above)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.

About City of York Council Meetings

Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088

Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন অর্ধাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোআবী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ مہیا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550

Holding the Executive to Account

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Executive (38 out of 47). Any 3 non-Executive councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Executive (or Executive Member Decision Session) agenda. The Executive will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Executive meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

Scrutiny Committees

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Date: 15 December 2010 **Ward:** Holgate
Team: Major and Commercial **Parish:** No Parish
Team

Reference: 10/02360/FUL
Application at: Bright Street Post Office 37 Stamford Street East York YO26 4YE
For: Conversion and alterations of existing post office and dwelling to create 2 dwellings
By: Mr Chris Cook
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 14 December 2010
Recommendation: Approve

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application relates to a two storey end terrace property which is located on the corner of Stamford Street East and Livingstone Street. The premises was last used as a Post Office with living accommodation to the rear and on the first floor. To the rear sits a single storey and separate two storey mono-pitch extension which are used as living accommodation. The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by terraced housing with associated shops and public houses.

1.2 The site lies within Flood Zone 2.

1.3 This application seeks planning permission to convert the property into two dwellings. The rear extensions are proposed to be demolished with a new pitched roof two storey rear extension added. The existing shop windows are proposed to be bricked up with windows and doors of a typically domestic scale being added to the ground floor of the property. Each dwelling would be two bedroom in size with a separate rear yard incorporating an enclosed cycle parking/refuse store.

1.4 This application has been brought before Planning Committee at the request of Cllr. Alexander in view of the retention of family sized housing in the Leeman Road area.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams GMS Constraints: West Area 0004

Schools GMS Constraints: St. Barnabas' CE Primary 0224

York North West Boundary GMS Constraints: York North West Boundary CONF

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design

CYGP4A Sustainability

CYGP15 Protection from flooding

CYH4A Housing Windfalls

CYL1C Provision of New Open Space in Development

CYS9 No loss of local or village shops

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL

3.1 Highway Network Management - No objections subject to a condition requiring the cycle parking to be laid out prior to the first occupation of the dwelling.

3.2 Leisure - No on site open space is provided, therefore a commuted sum should be sought.

EXTERNAL

3.3 Site Notice (posted 08/11/10) and Neighbour Letters - No correspondence received.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 Key Issues:

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Sustainability
- Flood Risk

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

4.2 Policy S9 relates to the loss of local shops. It states that permission will only be granted for a change of use where it can be demonstrated that a need for the local shopping facility no longer exists or where appropriate facilities exist within the local area. The ground floor of the application site is thought to have been last used as a Post Office, the applicants advise that it has been vacant since June 2009, it was marketed from 2008 but there was no strong interest in taking on the premises as an A1 retail unit. There are a number of premises in the surrounding area which provide

goods and services to the local community. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in a lack of local facilities in the area.

4.3 The application site is within the urban settlement and is considered to be in a sustainable location. The land is previously developed and the proposal makes efficient use of land.

4.4 The application was called in to Committee in the interest of retaining family sized housing in the Leeman Road area. The existing property consists of a redundant retail unit with three bedroom owners accommodation. The majority of dwellings in the surrounding area are modest terraced houses, typically consisting of two bedrooms. Although the proposed alterations would result in the loss of a three bedroom dwelling, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment shows a strong need for new two bedroom dwellings. Given that new two bedroom houses are needed as well as three bedroom houses and the proposal results in the net gain of one house, it is Officer opinion that the loss of a three bedroom dwelling does not warrant refusal of this application. It is considered that the principle of development is acceptable.

DESIGN

4.5 The main frontage of the premises has the character and appearance of a local retail unit. The premises has a shop window on both the Livingstone Street and Stamford Street East elevations, there is a door between these, on the junction between the roads. The windows are traditional in design and scale and it is considered that their removal would alter the character and appearance of the building. However, there is a precedent for alterations and the loss of shop windows in other premises in the area. The proposed window and door openings on the ground floor are generally in keeping with the character of this residential area in terms of their locations, proportions and design.

4.6 The existing single storey rear extension is not in keeping with the property or character of the area, it is considered that its removal is of benefit to the street scene. The proposed two storey rear extension is typical of many in terraced areas in the city. The eaves height matches that of the main house with a reduced ridge height so that it appears subservient. The proposed extension protrudes approximately 3.4m from the rear of the main house. Given the presence of an existing two storey rear extension which protrudes the same distance as that proposed, and that the design of the extension is generally in keeping with the existing property, the extension is considered acceptable.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

4.7 It is considered that there would be adequate internal space, outlook and space for the external storage of bicycles and bins within both proposed dwellings. Outdoor amenity space is relatively small as is common on many terraced houses in the area. The proposal involves the creation of one additional dwelling and therefore a commuted sum to contribute towards public open space has been agreed with the applicants.

4.8 The neighbours most likely to be affected by the proposed development are those living within the adjoining terraced house, 35 Stamford Street East, and those within the properties to the rear, 40, 42, and 42a Garfield Terrace. The proposed extension protrudes no further from the rear of the property than the existing two storey extension. Unlike the existing extension, the proposal has a dual pitched roof which allows for a lower eaves height to one side than the existing. Other than a rooflight there are no windows proposed for the side elevation of the extension which faces 35 Stamford Street East. It is not considered that the extension or change of use would significantly harm the amenities of residents of number 35.

4.9 The application site sits within a high density residential area where separation distances between properties are short. From main elevation to main elevation, there is a separation distance of approximately 17m between the application site and 42 and 42a Garfield Terrace to the rear. 42 and 42a Garfield Terrace has been extended to the rear at two storey level, the proposed extension would reduce the distance between the two properties at two storey level to around 10m. The extension at Garfield Terrace contains no windows within the rear elevation. For this reason it is not considered that the windows within the rear elevation of the proposed extension would lead to a loss of privacy to an extent which would warrant refusal of the application.

SUSTAINABILITY

4.10 A sustainability statement was provided with the application in line with Development Control Local Plan Policy GP4a. The statement highlights the sustainable location of the site and that cycle storage is to be provided. Renewable materials will be used where possible, such as sheep's wool insulation. Insulation and air tightness is to be of high standard and energy efficient lighting and heating systems are to be utilised. Recycling bins are to be provided and the applicant has confirmed the intention to install solar panels on the roofs of both dwellings to provide renewable energy.

FLOOD RISK

4.11 The application site is within Flood Zone 2, PPS 25 'Development and Flood Risk' states that residential development is appropriate in Flood Zone 2. A Flood Risk Assessment was submitted with the application stating that electrical fixtures are to be raised 450mm above finished floor level and all materials used at ground floor level are to be water resistant where possible and used in a way which makes them easily replaceable.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 As discussed above, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in line with local and national planning policy.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve

1 TIME2 Development start within three years

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:-

Drawing Number 10:49:01 received by The CoYC on 18/10/10

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

3 The bricks to be used externally shall match those of the existing buildings in colour, size, shape and texture.

Reason: To achieve a visually acceptable form of development.

4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), no door, window or other opening additional to those shown on the approved plans shall at any time be inserted on the east (side) elevation at first floor level of the extension hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupants of adjacent residential properties.

5 The building shall not be occupied until the areas shown on the approved plans for cycle storage have been constructed and laid out in accordance with the approved plans, and thereafter such areas shall be retained solely for such purposes.

Reason: To promote sustainable transport choice.

6 No development shall commence unless and until details of provision for public open space facilities or alternative arrangements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Open space shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved scheme or the alternatives arrangements agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented, prior to first occupation of the development.

Reason: In order to comply with the provisions of Policy L1c of the Development Control Local Plan which requires that all new housing sites make provision for the open space needs of future occupiers.

INFORMATIVE:

The alternative arrangements of the above condition could be satisfied by the completion of a planning obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by those having a legal interest in the application site, requiring a financial contribution towards off site provision of open space. The obligation should provide for a financial contribution calculated at £1,242.

No development can take place on this site until the public open space has been provided or the Planning Obligation has been completed and you are reminded of the

local planning authority's enforcement powers in this regard.

7 Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, solar panels shall be installed on each property to provide renewable energy, unless an alternative form of renewable energy source is agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To promote sustainable development

**7.0 INFORMATIVES:
Notes to Applicant**

1. REASON FOR APPROVAL

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to:

- Principle of Development;
- Design;
- Residential Amenity;
- Sustainability; and
- Flood Risk.

As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, GP4a, GP15a, H4a, L1c and S9 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

Contact details:

Author: Michael Jones Development Management Officer
Tel No: 01904 551339

37 Stamford Street East, YO26 4YE

10/02360/FUL



GIS by ESRI (UK)



Scale : 1:1250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2000.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	City of York Council
Department	Planning & Sustainable Development
Comments	Application site
Date	02 December 2010
SLA Number	Not set

This page is intentionally left blank



East Area Planning Sub Committee	2 nd December 2010
West and City Centre Area Planning Sub Committee	15 th December 2010
Planning Committee	16 th December 2010

Appeals Performance and Decision Summaries

Summary

- 1 This report (presented to both Sub Committees and Main Planning Committee) informs Members of the Council's performance in relation to appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate in the 3-month period up to 31st October 2010, and provides a summary of the salient points from appeals determined in that period. A list of outstanding appeals as at 31st October 2010 is also included.

Background

- 2 Appeal statistics are collated by the Planning Inspectorate on a quarterly basis. Whilst the percentage of appeals allowed against the Council's decision is no longer a National Performance Indicator, it has in the past been used to abate the amount of Housing and Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG) received by an Authority performing badly against the average appeals performance. Appeals performance has been close to the national average for a number of years.
- 3 Whilst the Inspectorate breaks down the appeals by type in reporting performance, the table below includes all types of appeals such as those against refusal of planning permission, against conditions of approval, enforcement notices, listed building applications and lawful development certificates. Figure 1 shows appeals decided by the Inspectorate, both by CYC Committee area and decision type for the 3 months and also the combined area (CYC) 12 month performance.

**Fig 1 : Appeals Decided by the Planning Inspectorate
For 3 months to 31st October 2010**

	East 3 months	West & CC 3 months	CYC 3 months	CYC 12 months
Allowed	2	2	4	14
Part Allowed	0	2	2	3
Dismissed	6	5	11	34
Total Decided	8	9	17	55
% Allowed	25.00%	22.22%	23.53%	25.45 %
% Part Allowed	0%	22.22%	11.76%	5.45%
Withdrawn	0	0	0	4

Analysis

- 4 The table shows that for the 3 months to 31st October 2010, a total of 17 appeals relating to CYC decisions were determined by the Inspectorate. Of those, 4 were allowed. At 23.53%, the rate of appeals allowed is well below the national average of around 33%, but higher than the 20% reported as allowed in the preceding 3 month period.
- 5 For the 12 months up to 30th June 2010, CYC performance was 25.92% allowed, a slightly higher percentage than the previously reported 12 month period of 26.32%, but still below national average.
- 6 The summaries of appeals determined in the 3 months to 31st October 2010 are included at Annex A. Details as to whether the application was dealt with under delegated powers or Committee (and in those cases the original officer recommendation) are included with each summary. In the period covered, 4 of the appeals determined related to applications refused by Committee:-
 - 10/00020/FUL: 43 West Thorpe – Part Allowed. Officer rec. approve
 - 10/00495/FUL: Derwent Barn, Langwith Stray –Dismissed. Officer rec. refuse
 - 10/00087/FUL:5 Northfileds Strensall- Dismissed. Officer rec. approve
 - 09/01324/FUL: 52 School Lane Fulford –Dismissed. Officer rec. refuse
- 7 The list of current appeals is attached at Annex B. There are 14 appeals lodged with the Planning Inspectorate, 8 in the East Sub Committee area and 6 in West and City Centre Sub Committee area. 9 are proposed to be dealt with by written representation process (W), 2 by Public Inquiry (P), 2 by Informal Hearing (I) and one by the Householder procedure (H).

Consultation

- 8 This is essentially an information report for Members and therefore no consultation has taken place regarding its content.

Corporate Objectives

- 9 The report is relevant to the furthering of the Council's objectives of making York a sustainable City, maintaining its special qualities, making it a safer city, and providing an effective organisation with high standards.

Implications

- 10 Financial – There are no financial implications directly arising from the report
- 11 Human Resources – There are no Human Resources implications directly involved within this report and the recommendations within it other than the need to allocate officer time towards the provision of the information
- 12 Legal – There are no known legal implications associated with this report or the recommendations within it.
- 13 There are no known Equalities, Property, Crime & Disorder or other implications associated with the recommendations within this report.

Risk Management

- 14 In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, there are no known risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

Recommendation

- 15 That Members note the content of this report.

Reason: So that members can continue to be updated on appeal decisions within the CYC area and be informed of the planning issues surrounding each case for future reference in determining planning applications.

Contact Details

Author:

Jonathan Carr,
Head of Development
Management,
Directorate of City Strategy

01904 551303

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Mike Slater
Assistant Director Planning & Sustainable
Development, Directorate of City Strategy

Report Approved



Date

22nd November
2010

Specialist Implications Officer(s) None.

Wards Affected:

All

 Y

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex A – Summaries of Appeals Determined between 1st August 2010 and 31st October 2010

Annex B – Outstanding Appeals to 22nd November 2010

This page is intentionally left blank

Appeal Summaries for Cases Determined 01/08/2010 to 31/10/2010

Application No: 09/01176/OUT
Appeal by: Bonnycroft LLP
Proposal: Outline application for erection of nursing home
Site: Bonnycroft □ 22 Princess Road □ Strensall □ York □ YO32 5UD □
Decision Level: COMM
Outcome: DISMIS

This application related to the development of a 50 bed nursing home in Strensall. The site is occupied by a derelict bungalow set within grounds of 0.5 ha. The site is constrained by a number of TPO's, there are dwellings on three sides and a railway line to the other. The application was in outline with all matters reserved for subsequent approval except access. □ The application was recommended for approval but refused at planning committee on the grounds that the proposal would be harmful to the amenities of local residents and to the character and appearance of the area. Indicative plans were submitted showing a building footprint; the proposal was split into three joined blocks measuring 2, 2.5, and 3 storeys in height. □ The appellants claimed that the Council was unreasonable to refuse the application on issues which were to be determined as part of any reserved matters application and that the Council could have eased any concerns through appropriate conditioning. The Inspector dismissed this stating that Circular 01/2006 expects outline applications to provide sufficient information to demonstrate that proposals have been properly considered in the light of planning policies and site constraints. Therefore the Council was entirely reasonable in refusing the application based on indicative plans. The second case for the appellant was that it had been demonstrated that the indicative plans cause no significant harm to neighbouring or visual amenity. The inspector dismissed this stating that the combination of the length, depth, and height of the proposed building was out of character with an area of modest scale individual buildings with open views above and between buildings. The Inspector also concluded that the structure would appear dominant and overbearing from neighbouring properties and that the vehicular activity along the boundary of a number of residential properties would create an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance. □

Application No: 09/01324/FUL
Appeal by: Mr J Walker
Proposal: Two storey pitched roof extension to rear
Site: 52 School Lane □ Fulford □ York □ YO10 4LS □
Decision Level: COMM
Outcome: DISMIS

The application related to a proposal to extend a granny annex (that was contained within a garage) into a two-storey dwelling (there was no occupancy/severance restriction condition). The building fronts School Lane, though was formally part of the long rear garden of 65 Main Street. The parking for the application property and 65 Main Street is accessed from School Lane and runs past the side of the existing annex. The proposal was refused because it was considered that the space for manoeuvring vehicles was too tight, the design out of character with the conservation area and the proposal would create conflict with neighbours living conditions/safety because of vehicles passing close to windows and an entrance door. □ □ The inspector felt that the design was visually acceptable but dismissed the appeal for the other reasons stated on the decision notice.

Application No: 09/01874/FUL
Appeal by: Mr Patrick Walker
Proposal: Change of use from hairdresser (use class A1) to hot food takeaway (use class A5)
Site: 4 Skeldergate □ York □ YO1 6DG □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: DISMIS

Appeal dismissed due to adverse impact on surrounding residents, due to potential noise and cooking smells. Advised that potential litter in the street was not grounds for refusal and that the type of food sold could not be controlled by condition, nor would this mitigate amenity concerns. □ □ Despite the proximity of the site to Micklegate/Bridge Street, Skeldergate is predominantly residential, different in character. The proposal would introduce a late night use (open until 02:00), with associated noise levels and behaviour. Also visitors in vehicles would add to noise levels. This would disturb surrounding residents, in particular the max. noise levels. □ □ Considered that cooking smells would have an unacceptable impact on residents. Despite the installation of equipment, there would be residual odour, and further cooking smells when windows/doors were open. □

Application No: 09/02095/FUL
Appeal by: Mr Nick Wright
Proposal: Change of use from domestic outbuilding to dwelling with additional storage building to side
Site: 1 Springfield Cottages□Hull Road□Dunnington□York□YO19 5LA□
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: DISMIS

The above application (09/02095) was to convert a relatively large outbuilding to a two bedroom dwelling. The site is close to the Scarborough roundabout on Hull Road. The application was refused for the following reasons:□□"The proposed alterations and creation of a separate dwelling would leave little external amenity space for either dwelling and create a cramped environment for vehicle parking and manoeuvring. Such arrangements have the potential to create a poor living environment and conflict between the occupants of the two properties, particularly through noise associated with late night or early morning vehicle movements. As such the proposal conflicts with policy GP1 (criterion b, g and i) of the City of York Draft Local Plan (fourth set of changes) approved April 2005."□□The inspector did not feel given the location close to Hull Road that noise concerns justified refusal. He did feel however, that the amount of garden space was less than would be expected and that the cramped parking arrangements may prove impractical - he felt this was of particular concern given the property's position adjacent to a dual carriage way a little way from local shops.□□He dismissed the appeal.□

Application No: 09/02099/OUT
Appeal by: Mrs Helen Butterworth
Proposal: Outline application for construction of 4no two-storey dwellings after demolition of existing dwelling
Site: Wellgarth House □ Wetherby Road □ Rufforth □ York □ YO23 3QB □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: DISMIS

Outline Planning Permission was refused in respect of an Outline application for erection of four houses on the cleared site of Wellgarth House a bed and breakfast establishment on the eastern edge of Rufforth in November 2009. Rufforth is a village defined as "washed over" Green Belt so any additional housing development should constitute limited "infilling". Reasons for refusal were quite extensive including impact upon the openness of the Green Belt, the design of the scheme not amounting to limited infilling, lack of information in respect of drainage details and lack of information in respect of the provision of affordable housing as part of the wider scheme in line with Draft Local Plan Policy. □ □ The inspector Zoe Hill examined each reason for refusal in turn. She agreed that the proposal amounted to "inappropriate development " in the Green Belt and that the proposed configuration of properties did not amount to "limited infill" in terms of Policy GB2 of the Draft Local Plan. The proposal was also felt to be highly injurious to the open character of the Green Belt. Conflict with the Rufforth VDS, Draft Local Plan Policy GP10 and the recent revision to PPS 3 in respect of the use of garden land for housing was also noted. Whilst not being in Flood Zone 1 the absence of necessary information in respect of surface water drainage was itself felt to be suitable reason for refusal of the proposal and it was not felt that these were appropriate matters which could be conditioned. In relation to the need to provide "affordable housing " in line with the City's Policy the village it was felt that the issue had again not been adequately addressed. The inspector supported the Authority's previous reasons for refusal in their entirety and the appeal was dismissed.

Application No: 09/02221/FUL
Appeal by: Mr Christopher Brown
Proposal: Change of use from 1no. house to 2no. flats
Site: 38 Leven Road□York□YO24 2TJ□
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: ALLOW

The application was for the conversion of a dwelling to two flats. The semi-detached dwelling is sited in a suburban area characterised by family sized dwellings, this part of the street is set around a relatively large grassed area. The application was refused on the grounds that the scheme would involve the loss of a three bedroom house. Based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2007 it was considered that the conversion of the dwelling to create two flats would have an unacceptable impact upon the city's housing stock, in particular having regard to the higher demand for houses within the city, the levels of 1 bedroom flats already permitted, the significant number of unimplemented permissions for flats and the higher rate of flat completions. As such the application as considered to conflict with Policy H8 of the Local Plan which seeks to retain an adequate supply of family housing stock, as supported by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2007. Similar appeal cases which were also submitted to the Inspectorate.□□The appeal was allowed. The Inspector did not give any weight to the Local Plan as it was not adopted and it was some time since it had been placed on deposit in 1998. In addition the Inspector argued that no weight could be given to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment the Inspector questioned the reliance on data from 2005 and 2006 in 2010. The Inspector made the point that it is important that SMHAs are updated, and there is no evidence that that has been done.□□The Inspector agreed to all the conditions put forward by the Council except the standard open space condition. The Inspector considered the policy had little weight, secondly the Council's condition was considered to be of doubtful precision; and thirdly the requirement for a commuted sum is not properly based, the level of occupation of the building would be unlikely to increase and as such suggests that there would be no additional requirement for public open space.

Application No: 09/02308/FUL
Appeal by: Mr David Grierson
Proposal: First floor rear extension
Site: 9A Green Lane □ Acomb □ York □ YO24 3DA □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: ALLOW

Proposed first floor rear extension above existing single storey rear extension at carpet shop to allow increased residential accommodation at first floor. Neighbouring house has large window at first floor side elevation, which appeared to be only window to that room (access to rear not possible due to ownership issues) Refused on impact/loss of light. At appeal site visit applicant allowed us into the rear area and became apparent that the side window was a secondary window. Appeal allowed.

Application No: 09/02322/FUL
Appeal by: Mr Jonathan Brack
Proposal: Erection of detached bungalow to rear after demolition of existing garage
Site: Acomb Chiropractic Clinic □ 60A York Road □ Acomb □ York □ YO24 4NW □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: DISMIS

The application was for a detached bungalow to the rear of the 60a York Road. The host building is a chiropractors practice, with a flat above and is set back from the road with a large parking area to the front and a small garden area and double garage to the rear. The proposed dwelling was of a modest scale but it was considered that its siting in the rear garden would result in a development that would appear cramped and out of character with the local form of development and the conservation area. In addition the proposal by virtue of its size, height and proximity to 60B York Road would have an overbearing and over dominant impact on the occupiers and would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure that would harm residential amenity and would result in a loss of outlook for the occupiers of No 60B York Road. The application was also refused on the grounds that insufficient drainage details have been submitted □ □ The appeal was dismissed, the Inspector agreed that the proposal would create a cramped situation, and noted that there was no other situation in the area so "enclosed and hemmed in" and considered that the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area, which is part of the Acomb Conservation Area. The Inspector agreed the proposal would create a second dwelling which would deprive the original dwelling of its domestic amenity space. The Inspector also considered that although the proposal would be on lowered land levels, and the roof would be hipped, it would still intrude significantly above the wall/fence. The proximity of the new dwelling would harmfully affect the living conditions of the occupants of No.60B by dominating the outlook from those primary windows. The Inspector felt that the drainage issues could be dealt with by condition. □

Application No: 10/00018/ADV
Appeal by: Mr Graham Kennedy
Proposal: Display of 1no externally illuminated fascia sign
(retrospective) (resubmission)
Site: Inner Space Stations□339 - 341 Hull
Road□Heslington□York□YO10 3LE□
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: ALLOW

This site is the BP Hull Road petrol filling station known as 'Inner Space Station'. Planning permission was granted on appeal several years ago for a number of car wash bays towards the rear of the site behind the main garage forecourt, bays which could open well into the evening. The appellant topped these bays with large internally illuminated bright yellow signs advertising the car washes. These signs faced directly towards houses on Tranby Avenue and were highly visible from the rear gardens and rooms of these houses. It was refused on the basis of the large spread of the signs across quite a substantial area coupled with their brightness and garish colour (bright yellow).□□The Inspector concluded that the level of artificial lighting and other signs on and around the site i.e. the adjacent B&Q site and the rest of the garage forecourt was already quite high. He also noted the fencing on the rear boundary between the houses and the appeal site and that this was supplemented by trees and hedges in most gardens and evergreen planting on the appeal site adjacent to this fencing. As a result the Inspector concluded that the signs were not particularly prominent from the gardens or ground floor rooms of the adjacent dwellings. (the hedges and vegetation had grown up significantly since the application was first refused). He did however agree that the very end illuminated sign should be removed along with the method of illumination as this was the most harmful part of the advert. This was volunteered by the appellant in order to improve the situation in his report the Inspector said that without this suggested deletion he would have dismissed the appeal. □□□□□□□□□□

Application No: 10/00020/FUL
Appeal by: Mr John McGarry
Proposal: First floor rear extension. Boundary wall to front and side.
Change of use and extension of garage to form retail unit
(resubmission)
Site: 43 West Thorpe □ York □ YO24 2PP □
Decision Level: COMM
Outcome: PAD

The appeal property is a semi-detached house on the corner of West Thorpe and Chaloners Road. The development proposed was a first floor rear extension, boundary wall to front and side; change of use and extension of garage to form retail unit. Sub-committee had refused the application but only in relation to the boundary wall (which was considered should be formed with infill railings rather than the proposed fence panels) and the retail unit (which was considered to harm residential amenity). □ □ The Inspector opined that even a modestly sized retail unit would be significantly at odds with the established pattern of development. Moreover as the intention was to draw business from passing trade the unit would need to be reasonably prominent in the streetscene, so as to attract the attention of potential customers. In these respects she considered that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. She did not feel that there would be harm to amenity from the key-cutting process but considered that the additional activity around the unit from the comings and goings of customers and vehicles would cause an unacceptable degree of disturbance to neighbouring residents. The Inspector noted that whilst the proposed wall would have a somewhat more solid quality than the low walls and hedges which tend to characterise nearby properties, it would be seen in the context of quite a spacious road junction. Consequently, she was not convinced that it would cause harm to the open aspect of the streetscene. □ □ The Inspector part allowed the appeal and granted planning permission for the extension to the house and the new wall.

Application No: 10/00073/FUL
Appeal by: Mr Richard Foster
Proposal: Garage with berths for 3no. cars and 1no. caravan
Site: Forest Farm □ Lingcroft Lane To Crockey Hill □ York □ YO19
4RE □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: DISMIS

Appeal relating to the erection of a garage with berths for three cars and one caravan. Garage was proposed to be used for domestic purposes in relation to Forest Farm House, located off the A19 in Fulford. The site is within the Green Belt. The original application was refused as the garage was considered to be a disproportionate addition to the dwelling which was inappropriate in the Green Belt and also that the garage would harm the openness of the Green Belt given its size and height and prominent location. The Inspector was in agreement with the Council's decision and dismissed the appeal.

Application No: 10/00087/FUL
Appeal by: Moorside Developments Ltd
Proposal: Erection of 3no. dwellinghouses to rear of 5 and 6 Northfields (amended scheme) (resubmission)
Site: 5 Northfields □ Strensall □ York □ YO32 5XN □
Decision Level: COMM
Outcome: DISMIS

The application is for a terrace of three starter homes facing the public highway in a residential area. The planning committee overturned the officers recommendation, which was to approve. The essence of the reason for refusal was that the amount of street frontage occupied by hardstanding, relative to the amount retained for landscaping, resulted in a development that was out of keeping with the distinctive character and appearance of the area □ □ The inspector disagreed and found that the scheme struck a good balance between developing the site in an efficient manner while providing adequate off street parking and meaningful landscaping. Turning to the councils suggested conditions she found that there was a clear requirement under policy L1c for a financial contribution towards open space; she acknowledged that the local plan has not been adopted but found that L1c reflects the objectives of PPG17. However, paragraph 13 of Circular 11 of 1995 is clear that planning permission cannot be granted subject to a condition that the applicant enters into a s.106 agreement. In the absence of such an agreement the appeal was dismissed. □ □ Regarding costs, the inspector made clear that whilst Members are not bound to accept the recommendation of officers they must substantiate their decision and reasons for refusal. She found that Members had carried out little objective analysis of the scheme or adjacent buildings. This constituted unreasonable behaviour resulting in the applicant incurring unnecessary expense due to the councils reason for refusal. She found that the council had not acted unreasonably by failing to secure an open space contribution through a s.106 agreement. The award of costs was therefore only partial because the need for the appeal could not have been wholly avoided due to the failure of the appellant to provide a s.106 agreement. □ □ Kevin O'Connell □

Application No: 10/00495/FUL
Appeal by: Matthew Clements
Proposal: First floor pitched roof side extension (resubmission)
Site: Derwent Barn □ Langwith Stray □ Heslington □ York □ YO10 5EJ □
Decision Level: COMM
Outcome: DISMIS

The appeal relates to a converted barn - one of two which, along with the adjacent farmhouse, forms a small enclave of homes surrounded by open countryside in the York Green Belt. It was against refusal of an increase in the roof height by 1m of an existing s/s side extension, on the western side of the barn, between it and the original farm house. The proposal was to allow the creation of a fourth bedroom. The Council's refusal was on the basis of the harm to the character and appearance of the site and the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt from the height and design of the proposal (which involved the breaking into the roof slope of the original barn). The proposal would reduce the sapce between the barn and former farm house and erode the setting and relationship between this collection of former farm buildings. □ The Inspector, in dismissing the appeal, referred to the distinctive attributes of this cluster of buildings, being: 1. the palpable sense of spaciousness from its setting in open countryside and generous plots; and 2. the resemblance to a farmstead with two stone barns reflecting their former function from the retention of the dominant two storey elements. He noted that the existing extension (allowed at the time of conversion to replace a lean to) was out of place due to its size and design. He felt that the increase and domestic design of the proposal would further reduce the 'visual penetration' and erode the feelin of space between and around the appeal property and buildings, resulting in a cramped and awkward appearance. This would diminish the positive visual characteristics of the appeal property and grouping of buildings, and as it would be visible form the countryside beyond, would harm the character and appearance of the existing house, surrounding area and the visual amenity of the Green Belt, contrary to national and local policy. □ No harm to neighbour. Personal circumstances did not outweigh harm.

Application No: 10/00544/FUL
Appeal by: Mr Alan Press
Proposal: Erection of wall, pillars, gates and railings to east and north boundaries
Site: Victoria Farm House □ Victoria Farm Estate □ York □ YO30 6PQ □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: ALLOW

The appeal related to the erection of a 1.5m high dwarf wall and railings around the open plan front garden of the above property. As the area of Water Lane where the wall is proposed is semi-rural in appearance and partly characterised by narrow landscaped verges in front of buildings/hedgerows it was requested that the wall be set back around a metre from the pavement edge and a strip of greenery retained. The applicant refused to do this. □□The Inspector allowed the appeal. He felt that the proposal was not unacceptable and that a lower wall that might be less attractive could be built flush to the footpath without needing planning permission. □□Although not a planning issue, it seems to be the case that though within the applicant's ownership the front strip of his garden is classified as part of the highway and there may be highway objections to erecting a wall flush to the edge of the footpath. This was clarified in an informative on the refusal notice.

Application No: 10/00548/FUL
Appeal by: Mr Darren Callaghan
Proposal: First floor pitched roof side extension
Site: 12 Weavers Close □ Copmanthorpe □ York □ YO23 3XL □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: DISMIS

The appeal property is situated on a corner plot and set forward of the neighbouring dwellings on Weavers Close. The appeal dwelling has already been extended at the side adjacent to No 11, to provide a garage and dayroom. The appeal proposal is to extend above the garage to create an □ additional bedroom □□Because of the proximity of the proposed extension to the front elevation of No 11, its position forward of that neighbouring dwelling, and the orientation of these properties, it would be likely to increase overshadowing of the front garden area and reduce daylight within the nearest front facing rooms. □□The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation and have a lower ridge height. Thus, it would have a subservient relationship to the original front elevation. However, the proposed ground floor roof treatment would result in an uncharacteristic, relatively bulky, hipped element to the front □ of the proposed first floor extension. The design of this part of the roof would also result in the front facing, first floor, window in the proposed extension appearing awkwardly placed.

Application No: 10/00664/FUL
Appeal by: Prof Stuart Murray
Proposal: Two storey pitched roof side extension and excavation of part of front garden to create a parking space
Site: 111 Holgate Road □ York □ YO24 4AZ □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: PAD

The application was for a two storey side extension and excavation of part of front garden to create a parking space. The house is adjacent to the boundary of the St Paul's Square/Holgate Road Conservation Area. It is part of a small estate of typical mid C20th semi-detached houses. The house is in an elevated position behind a landscaped front garden facing Holgate Road where it curves as it starts a descent towards the junction with Acomb Road. The road appears to be in a cutting at this point with brick walls on either side. □ □ The Council did not have an objection to the two storey side extension however the proposed parking space was considered to result in a damaging wide gap to the high brick retaining wall which provides an attractive means of enclosure to the road. As such the proposed parking space was considered to cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting and was refused on this basis. □ □ The two storey side extension was allowed but the appeal for the parking space was dismissed. The Inspector took note of the CYC Conservation Area Statement of the area. The Inspector agreed that the works would severely diminish the sense of containment, and in doing so would significantly compromise the character and appearance of the street scene and the Conservation Area. The inspectorate did not agree with the Council's statement that the parking space would materially harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. □

Application No: 10/01088/FUL
Appeal by: Mr David Littlewood
Proposal: Two storey side and rear extensions and single storey rear extension after demolition of existing extension
Site: 10 Ouse Acres □ York □ YO26 5SJ □
Decision Level: DEL
Outcome: DISMIS

The appeal property sits at right angles to the adjacent houses to the north, Nos. 2 and 4 Caxton Avenue. The two storey element of the proposal would be set back slightly from the front elevation of the house but would project some 2.7m beyond the main rear wall. No. 4 Caxton Avenue has a small rear garden which is already relatively enclosed because of the surrounding development. In this context, the proposed extension would appear extremely dominant and intrusive in views from the neighbouring property, owing to its height and its position on the boundary. I appreciate that the extension would not cast a great deal of shade during the summer months, as indicated by the submitted photograph. Nevertheless, given the relationship between the two properties, it would be likely to do so at other times of year when the sun is lower in the sky.

Decision Level:

DEL = Delegated Decision

COMM = Sub-Committee Decision

COMP = Main Committee Decision

Outcome:

ALLOW = Appeal Allowed

DISMIS = Appeal Dismissed

PAD = Appeal part dismissed/part allowed

This page is intentionally left blank

Outstanding appeals

Officer: Billy Wong						Total number of appeals: 1
Received on: 11/05/2010	Ref No: 10/00024/REF	Appeal Ref No: APP/C2741/A/2128424/NWF	Process: I	Site: Land Lying To The West Of Metcalfe Lane Osbaldwick	Description: Change of use of agricultural land into nature conservation area with public access	
Officer: Erik Matthews						Total number of appeals: 1
Received on: 01/09/2010	Ref No: 10/00042/REF	Appeal Ref No: APP/C2741/E/10/2134335	Process: W	Site: 35 Micklegate York YO1 6JH	Description: Retention of a suspended ceiling on the ground floor	
Officer: Gareth Arnold						Total number of appeals: 1
Received on: 11/10/2010	Ref No: 10/00048/REF	Appeal Ref No: APP/C2741/A/10/2138037/WF	Process: W	Site: Nursery Moor Lane Bishopthorpe York YO23	Description: Two storey pitched roof detached dwelling on land between North Moor and Foxglove Cottage	
Officer: Hannah Blackburn						Total number of appeals: 2
Received on: 20/07/2010	Ref No: 10/00032/FUL	Appeal Ref No: APP/C2741/A/10/2131700/NWF	Process: W	Site: OS Field 0553 Elvington Lane Dunnington York	Description: Erection of stable block (retrospective)	
Received on: 01/07/2010	Ref No: 10/00030/EN	Appeal Ref No: APP/C2741/C/10/2131736	Process: P	Site: OS Field 0553 Elvington Lane Dunnington York	Description: Appeal against	
Officer: Heather Fairy (Mon - Wed)						Total number of appeals: 2
Received on: 26/07/2010	Ref No: 10/00036/REF	Appeal Ref No: APP/C2741/A/10/2133267/WF	Process: W	Site: 19 West Thorpe York YO24 2PN	Description: Two storey detached dwelling (resubmission)	
Received on: 29/09/2010	Ref No: 10/00045/REF	Appeal Ref No: APP/C2741/A/10/2137575	Process: W	Site: Site Of Proposed Telecommunications Mast	Description: Erection of 11.8 m high streetpole telecommunications monopole with ancillary equipment	
Officer: Jonathan Kenyon						Total number of appeals: 1
Received on: 13/10/2010	Ref No: 10/00049/REF	Appeal Ref No: APP/C2741/A/10/2138481/WF	Process: W	Site: Land On Corner Of Tadcaster Road And Old Moor Lane	Description: Detached single storey dwelling with access from Old Moor Lane (revised scheme)	

Officer: Kevin O'Connell **Total number of appeals: 3**

Received on:	Ref No:	Appeal Ref No:	Process:	Site:	Description:
08/07/2010	10/00033/REF	APP/C/2741/X/10/2132047	P	22 Mill Lane Wigginton York YO32 2PX	Lawful Development Certificate for the existing use of an outbuilding to the rear of 22 Mill Lane as a retail shop (Class A1)
01/09/2010	10/00043/REF	APP/C2741/A/10/2135743/NWF	W	Lake Cottage Wheldrake Lane Elvington York YO41	Change of use from holiday let (use class C1) to residential dwelling (use class C3) for family member
27/10/2010	10/00051/REF	APP/C2741/A/10/2139477/NWF	I	The Stables Elvington Lane Elvington York	Change of use of buildings/land for travelling showpeople's site for one family

Officer: Matthew Parkinson **Total number of appeals: 2**

Received on:	Ref No:	Appeal Ref No:	Process:	Site:	Description:
17/06/2010	10/00029/EN	APP/C/2741/C/10/2130522	W	106 Albion Avenue York YO26 5QY	Appeal against
08/09/2010	10/00047/REF	APP/C2741/A/10/2136045/WF	W	440 Malton Road Huntington York YO32 9TE	Conversion of former dairy barn to single dwelling incorporating double garage

Officer: Sharon Jackson **Total number of appeals: 1**

Received on:	Ref No:	Appeal Ref No:	Process:	Site:	Description:
25/10/2010	10/00050/REF	APP/C2741/D/10/2139229	H	13 Grange Street York YO10 4BH	Single storey pitched roof rear extensions

Total number of appeals: 14