

Meeting	Area Planning Sub-Committee
Date	4 May 2017
Present	Councillors Galvin (Chair), Shepherd (Vice-Chair), Carr, Craghill, Gillies, Hunter, Cannon, Flinders, Mercer and Orrell
Apologies	Councillor Looker

Site	Visited by	Reason
5 Lynwood Avenue, Copmanthorpe	Councillors Galvin, Shepherd, Carr and Gillies	As the recommendation was to approve and objections had been received
Pool Bridge Farm, Crockey Hill	Councillors Galvin and Shepherd	To enable Members to understand the site layout and see the relationship of the proposed building with the open countryside
Former London's store, 31A Hawthorn Grove	Councillors Galvin and Shepherd	As the recommendation was to approve and objections had been received

52. Declarations of Interest

Members were invited to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests, not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial interests or disclosable pecuniary interests that they might have had in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

53. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the Area Planning Sub Committee meeting held on 6 April 2017 be approved and then signed by the Chair as a correct record.

54. Public Participation

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

55. Plans List

55a) Pool Bridge Farm, Wheldrake Lane, York, YO19 4SQ (17/00411/OUT)

Members considered an outline application by Mr Stephen Fletcher for the erection of a two-storey dwelling with office including the conversion of existing storage building (resubmission).

Officers gave an update, which was attached to the online agenda following the meeting. This included a minor correction to the Officer's report and a summary of additional information submitted since agenda publication.

Steven Fletcher, the applicant, spoke to stress the importance of having a permanent onsite presence for the running of the business, security and animal welfare. He stated that he would be happy to accept an agricultural occupancy condition should Members be minded to approve the application.

Graham Fletcher, agent for the applicant, reminded Members of NPPF guidance on supporting sustainable, rural tourism and stated that this business was an important leisure and tourism facility for the City. He also stressed that the proposal was of a design that would integrate well with its surroundings.

In response to Member questions Mr Fletcher clarified that:

- Catching trespassers on the farm was a regular occurrence and had several police incident numbers evidencing this.
- There was CCTV covering the farm, but as there were public footpaths throughout the farm, the only way to detect intruders was to have an experienced manager on site.

During debate there were some Members who felt that the applicant had failed to demonstrate an essential need for another property on the site, however a majority felt that it was important to encourage sustainable business and that physical security and the welfare of the animals on site should be given due consideration. It was also felt that the building would not be intrusive.

Resolved: That the application be approved with conditions to be agreed by the Chair and Vice-Chair

Reason: The proposal would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The applicant presented a compelling case of "very special circumstances", in particular that there was an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently on the site. There was also consideration given to diversification of former agricultural land, supporting sustainable business and animal welfare and supporting and encouraging rural enterprises and businesses. This outweighed the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness as specifically required by paragraph 88 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

55b) 14 Priory Street, York, YO1 6EX (17/00093/FUL)

Members considered a full application by Mr Matthew Farrelly for a variation of condition 2 and removal of condition 3 of permitted application 16/00261/FUL (Conversion of four storey dwelling into two self contained flats) to add 2no. roof lights to front.

Officers reminded Members that this was an item which had been deferred at the last meeting of this committee.

The applicant, Matthew Farrelly spoke to explain the amendments to the application and to remind Members who had visited the site that the lights would not be visually prominent from the street. He also stated that there were 6-8 other properties with similar lights in the vicinity of his property.

In response to questions from Members he stated that whilst four rooflights in one room seemed a lot, it was a large space

and there were several properties facing the City walls with similar rooflights.

During debate some Members felt that the application should be refused on the grounds that this would harm the character and appearance of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area. Conversely, many Members reasoned that this impact would be minimal, given that the lights would not be seen from the street.

Resolved: That the application be approved with conditions to be agreed by the Chair and Vice-Chair

Reason: It was considered that the proposed roof lights would not be visually intrusive from the street and would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area.

**55c) 5 Lynwood Avenue, Copmanthorpe, York, YO23 3SP
(17/00219/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Mrs Laura Hindle for a single storey rear extension.

Officers gave an update, which was attached to the online agenda following the meeting. This explained an amendment which had been made to the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) in April and referred to an additional drawing which had been received.

The Chair circulated a letter of objection to Members.

Mr John McCaffery, a neighbour, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that in his opinion misrepresentations had been made in the application and that the roof height would be greater than was quoted in the drawings. He also discussed the impact he felt the building work would have on his disability.

Nick Hindle, the applicant, stated that this single-story extension was to create an open plan family space and would match the existing extension. He reminded Members that this was only 60cm longer than would be allowed under permitted development rights and explained that the builders would be using methods that would minimise disruption, particularly in relation to dust.

Officers reminded Members that the extension would have to be built to the specifications in the drawing and that, should breaches be found, it would become an issue for planning enforcement.

Members agreed that the approved plans showed a height of 2.7 metres and those who had been on the site visit could see no reason to refuse the application.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report.

Reason: The scale and design of the proposed extension is considered to be appropriate to the host dwelling and the appearance of the streetscene. Whilst there will be an impact on outlook and light to the rear of the adjoining house this is not considered to justify the refusal of the application. On balance the proposals are considered to comply with the NPPF, Draft Local Plan Policies H7 and GP1, Supplementary Planning Guidance - House Extensions and Alterations (Approved 2012) and Copmanthorpe Village Design Statement.

**55d) Former Londons, 31A Hawthorn Grove, York, YO31 7UA
(17/00088/FULM)**

Members considered a major full application by Miss J Golightly for the conversion of a shop (use class A1) to 10no. apartments (use class C3) with external alterations.

Officers provided an update stating that some minor modifications had been submitted to the application relating to bin and cycle storage and lowering windows by 8 inches.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report and a Section 106 agreement.

Reason: The principle of residential use of the site has previously been agreed. There is an eclectic mix of building forms in the vicinity and in the context the proposal is considered acceptable. It is considered that the enclosure/ landscaping of the front forecourt will enhance the setting of the building. Most of the

flats will have one bedroom. They appear well proportioned and offer separate sleeping and living accommodation, rather than being of the 'studio' type. The site is sustainably located. A Section 106 agreement will be required to ensure that the development does not put additional pressure on the locality's residents parking scheme.

Councillor Galvin, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.35 pm and finished at 5.35 pm].