

Meeting	Area Planning Sub-Committee
Date	6 April 2017
Present	Councillors Galvin (Chair), Shepherd (Vice-Chair), Carr, Craghill, Gillies, Hunter, Cannon, Flinders, Looker, Mercer and Orrell

Site	Visited by	Reason
14 Priory Street	Cllrs Shepherd, Orrell, Craghill, Cannon, Gillies and Mercer and Flinders.	At the request of the Ward Councillor.
55-56 Fossgate	Cllrs Shepherd, Orrell, Craghill, Cannon, Gillies and Mercer and Flinders.	To allow Members to assess the impact of the proposal on the Conservation area and listed building.

48. 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.

Councillor Gillies declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in Item 4a/b as a member of the Merchant Adventurers, however had not been privy to any discussion on the application.

49. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of Area Planning Sub Committee meetings held on 2 February 2017 and 2 March 2017 were approved and then signed by the Chair as a correct record.

50. 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.

51. Plans List

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Planning & Public Protection) relating to the following planning applications outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views of consultees and Officers.

51a) 55 - 56 Fossgate, York (17/00159/ADV)

Members considered an advert application by York Civic Trust for the display of 1 no. non illuminated metal banner sign spanning between numbers 5 and 55 - 56 Fossgate.

David Fraser, from the York Civic Trust, spoke on behalf of the applicants. He stated that the application had the full support of local traders and residents, the Merchant Adventurers and the York Business Improvement District (BID). He stated that Fossgate should be considered a special case and that this would therefore not set a precedent. He also expressed the opinion that the sign was of a high quality and would add, not detract, from the area.

Sarah Lakin spoke, on behalf of Fossgate Traders Association, to urge Members to approve the application and support the small independent businesses on the street. She stated that since the A board ban Fossgate was even more unseen and this sign was vital to improving footfall.

Officers, including the Design & Sustainability Manager, gave an update and stated that, whilst the council were fully in support of the traders, they did not feel this banner was the right solution. The sign was considered to harm the appearance of the street and would harm the conservation area and views from Fossgate. There was concern that allowing a sign on Fossgate would set a precedent and that the cumulative impact of signs across the city would be detrimental to the Conservation Area.

In response to Member questions Officers clarified:

- There was a feeling it was inappropriate to rebrand an area based upon one aspect of its history.
- If Members were minded to approve the application the weight of the sign and the method of attaching it would

need to be assessed by a structural engineer to ensure no harm to buildings.

- Improvements could be made to the area through the public realm that would be more effective than the proposed sign.

During debate some of the following issues were raised:

- Some Members felt that the sign would cause harm to the area and were supportive of the Officer recommendation to refuse. Conversely, many Members felt that it was important to support the traders, particularly in light of the A board ban, and felt there would be strong economic and public benefits.
- There was some concern around the traffic on Fossgate being a larger issue than the street's location and many Members felt that this should be dealt with for the benefit of traders.
- The visual impact of the sign was a matter of judgement, but there was no clear continuation from Fossgate from Colliergate and this sign would catch the eye and increase footfall.
- It was important to consider that this application had been proposed by the York Civic Trust and had the support of the Merchant Adventurers, York BID and the Guildhall Planning Panel.

Councillor Shepherd moved refusal of the application, in line with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Cannon seconded. On being put to the vote the motion fell.

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

Reason: It was considered that the sign was an appropriate design for the area and that it would not cause undue harm to the visual amenity of the Conservation Area or the setting of listed buildings. It was also felt that the public and economic benefits of the increased footfall the application may result in would outweigh the minor harm that had been identified.

51b) 55 - 56 Fossgate, York (17/00071/LBC)

Members considered a listed building consent application by York Civic Trust for the erection of a metal banner sign spanning between numbers 5 and 55 - 56 Fossgate.

Updates and discussion for this item were as minute item 51a (55-56 Fossgate, York (17/00159/ADV)).

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

Reason: It was considered that the sign was an appropriate design for the area and that it would not cause undue harm to the visual amenity of the Conservation Area or the setting of listed buildings. It was also felt that the public and economic benefits of the increased footfall the application may result in would outweigh the minor harm that had been identified.

51c) 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 a dormer to rear and 2no. roof lights to front.

There was no officer update for this item.

Matthew Farrelly, the applicant, spoke to inform Members that he felt the application would have minimal impact on public amenity as the area from which the lights would be visible was not open, public space. He stated that the design was well thought out and sympathetic to its surroundings and had the full support of neighbours.

In response to Member questions he clarified that he already had permission for two lights at the rear. Officers confirmed that the previously approved rear lights would be visible from the City Walls and that the roofscape formed part of the character of the conservation area.

During debate Members were strongly of the view that, whilst the rooflights would be acceptable to the Committee, they would not wish to approve the application with the dormer included.

Councillor Craghill proposed that the application be deferred in order for the applicant to consider the comments of the Committee. Councillor Gillies seconded.

Resolved: That the application be deferred.

Reason: To allow the applicant the opportunity to amend his application, in light of the Committees comments.

51d) 339 Huntington Road, York, YO31 9HJ (17/00106/FUL)

Members considered a full application by Mrs Anna Pawson for two storey side and single storey rear extensions.

There was no officer update on this item.

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

Reason: The proposed extension would retain the residential character of the street scene and would not harm the amenity of neighbouring dwellings in terms of proximity, light or overlooking. For this reason, the proposal was considered to comply with the NPPF and Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Draft Local Plan, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (December 2012).

51e) 18 Newlands Road, Bishopthorpe, York, YO23 2RT (17/00410/FUL)

Members considered a full application by Steven Prendergast for a single storey rear extension.

Officers updated Members to state that one response had been received from Bishopthorpe Parish Council, who had no objection to the application.

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

Reason: The proposals would have a positive impact on the character of the dwelling and area and would not result in any harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties. They are considered to comply with the NPFF, CYC Development Local Plan Policies H7 and GP1 and Supplementary Planning Guidance – House Extensions and Alterations (Approved 2012).

Councillor Galvin, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 5.35 pm].