

---

Meeting	Area Planning Sub-Committee
Date	5 September 2013
Present	Councillors McIlveen (Chair), Gillies (Vice-Chair), Douglas, Watson, Semlyen, Looker, Fitzpatrick, Galvin, Cuthbertson, Hyman and Warters

---

Site Visited	Attended by	Reason for Visit
Former Civic Amenity Site, Beckfield Lane	Councillors Cuthbertson Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Gillies, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters and Watson.	As objections had been received and the Officer's recommendation was to approve.
Wills and Ellis Garage, Boroughbridge Road	Councillors Cuthbertson Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Gillies, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters and Watson.	As objections had been received and the Officer's recommendation was to approve.
Great Outdoors, Stirling Road	Councillors Cuthbertson Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Gillies, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters and Watson.	As objections had been received and the Officer's recommendation was to approve.

## 18. Declarations of Interest

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or pecuniary interests not included on the Register of Interests that they might have had in business on the agenda. No interests were declared.

## **19. Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting of the Area Planning Sub-Committee held on 8 August 2013 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

## **20. 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.

## **21. Plans List**

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (City Development and Sustainability) relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views of consultees and Officers.

### **21a) 1 Foxthorn Paddock, York, YO10 5HJ (13/01327/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Mr N Malloy for a two storey side and single storey rear extensions.

Officers provided an update on the application. They reported that a written representation had been received from Cllr Barnes who had called in the original application which was deferred at the meeting on 8 August as Members wished to see a detailed shadow study before making a decision. In his written representation he asked the committee to ensure they had seen the comments on shadowing provided by Ormonde Architects and considered the oral representation to be made by Saad Ali of 71 Yarburgh Way and the written representation of Stephanie Leeman, another neighbour, all of which cast doubt on the shadow reports submitted by the applicant and raised the following concerns:

- The drawings were not accurate in their massing and appear to present misleading information.

- Reference to the BRE document “ Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice” part of which discusses the impact of badly planned developments.
- The reduction of overall depth of the extension does not in fact reduce the loss of light or overshadowing of the main living spaces.

His written representation drew Members attention to the two key aspects of the planning inspectors original refusal to uphold the applicants appeal (i.e. excessive size of the extension and resulting shadowing), and expressed the opinion that the resubmission still did not address these points so asked them not to approve the application.

A copy of a written representation submitted by Duncan Macleman or Ormonde Architects was also circulated to Members. This reiterated the concerns of Dr Ali as well as expressing concern regarding the lack of information on health and safety concerns raised with regard to the construction.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the results of the detailed shadow study, which had been submitted on behalf of the applicant by David Chapman Associates. This included 3D images showing the existing and proposed shadow pattern incorporating the proposed extension in terms of its impact on the closest neighbours. He explained that the most significant overshadowing occurred as the sun passes between the corridor between the two properties. He advised Members that this only provided a snapshot, and was only an aid to decision making. If Members were satisfied that the shadow study illustrated that the degree of overshadowing was satisfactory, they must then consider the issue of over dominance.

Representations were received from Leonardo Ali (on behalf of Dr Saad Ali). He stated that the reduced scale did not alleviate the reasons for the original refusal of the application and that the design and overshadowing caused by the planned extension would still reduce the amenity to his property. Furthermore he stated that the revised design conflicted with National Planning Framework and he raised concerns regarding health and safety during construction of the extension.

Representations were received from Colin Malloy, the applicant. He advised the Committee that the shadow report had been

submitted as requested and had been reviewed by Sharon Jackson, Development Management Assistant who had stated in her report that the extension would not harm the living conditions of nearby neighbours. He explained that the shadow report confirmed that any additional overshadowing caused by the extension would be confined to early morning and later on in the day it cast a shadow over his own garden. He assured Members that this report was accurate. With regards to concerns raised regarding safety during the construction, he advised Members that scaffolding would be erected on the inside of the new wall on his own land.

Members accepted that the main outstanding issue was that of overshadowing and agreed that the shadow report proved that the main impact of any overshadowing would be to the applicant himself and that the degree of overshadowing to the neighbouring property was not as extreme as Members had feared.

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

Reason: It was considered that the proposal would not unduly harm the living conditions of nearby neighbours at 71 Yarburgh Way and 6 Hesketh Bank, with particular reference to overdominance and overshadowing, or appear incongruous in the street scene.

**21b) Former Civic Amenity Site, Beckfield Lane, York  
(13/01833/FULM)**

Members considered a full major application by City of York Council for the erection of 18 dwelling houses and nine apartments with associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

Officers provided a verbal update on the application. They reported that five further objections had been received from residents, the majority of which re-iterated concerns already expressed and included on the agenda. The main concerns related to the lack of on-site parking, the impact of additional parking and congestion in Old School Walk, particularly when the adjacent sports pitches were in use, the design of the

houses being out of keeping, and the proximity of unit 8 to the adjacent property to the south. An email had been received from the Ward Councillor, Tracey Simpson-Laing, requesting that parking restrictions and traffic calming measures be introduced in Old School Walk.

Officers reported that the Council's drainage engineers were satisfied that the site could be adequately drained using standard storage and attenuation methods. This could be covered by condition. The only outstanding issue was the decommissioning of the existing sewers on the site, which would require a separate agreement with Yorkshire water. As this was an entirely separate issue to the planning application, officers requested that the recommendation be changed from "delegated authority to approve" to "approve". A condition was also recommended to control additional windows being inserted in certain properties in order to protect the amenity and living conditions of neighbours.

Members asked that the applicant set an example and be requested to reuse as much of the existing materials as possible such as the pan tiles, old brick as rubble etc.

In response to a query from Members, the Council's Senior Flood Risk Engineer explained how the drainage scheme would work. He stated that the drainage scheme submitted by the applicant showed that they could achieve the necessary reduction in discharge rates through on site storage of surface water.

Members questioned whether discussion had taken place regarding the replanting of the existing yew tree at the front of the site. Officers advised they had liaised with the landscape architect who had raised concerns that if it was dug up, it could cause damage to the roots of the two adjacent large trees, but agreed they would look at the options further.

Representations were received from Robert Petyt, a neighbour living at 13 Turnberry Drive in objection to the application. He stated that he was not against development on the site but expressed the view that the proposals needed further changes due to the following concerns:

- proximity of unit 8 to his property. This is the smallest distance between the development and any of the existing

houses and it relates to the tallest property on the development.

- The development would cover 90% of the rear of his garden and would create a shadow and unpleasant outlook - this would have a negative effect on family life and affect the value of the property.
- Traffic on Beckfield Lane is very busy at times, particularly around the shops and when football matches take place. With additional housing and insufficient parking, this situation would get worse.

Representations were received from Mr Jordan Gill, the architect and agent, in support of the application. He made the following comments:

- Access from Old School Walk rather than Beckfield Lane had been agreed at pre-application submission stage through consultation with highways. The junction had been assessed and deemed adequate.
- Traffic regulations and traffic calming measures would control traffic speed and parking on the street.
- A public event had been held which provided local residents with information on the design of the development. A decision had subsequently been taken to reduce the number of properties by one.
- The final scheme represents a collaborative design with considerable input from all stakeholders.

Councillor Simpson Laing spoke in support of the application in her role as Ward Councillor for Acomb and Cabinet Member for Health, Housing and Adult Social Services. She made the following points:

- The site had been identified as a housing site a long time ago – pleased to see application for housing development
- The mix of properties were in line with the needs of the waiting list and follow policy guidelines
- Double yellow lines and other traffic regulations would control traffic and parking concerns. She suggested that chicanes were considered as traffic goes quite quickly down Old School Lane.
- The football club has a travel plan in place – she suggested officers contact the football club re parking arrangements on match days.

- These are the first council houses to actually be built by City of York Council.

Members discussed the following issues:

- Concerns over the limited parking available at the junior football club at the end of Old School Walk which leads to parking on the street when matches are played. Members acknowledged the need to find a solution to football club parking and the need for additional traffic regulations on the street.
- In response to question as to why the existing entrance from Beckfield Lane had been discounted in favour of an entrance from Old School Walk (bearing in mind that this the entrance to Old School Walk is opposite the shops and next to a pedestrian crossing) highway officers advised that this was considered better in terms of urban design and considered suitable as traffic generated would be very light. Furthermore the Old School Walk/Beckfield Lane junction offered adequate visibility in accordance with national guidance.
- Drainage – Members took into account information provided by officers in response to concerns raised.
- Members sought clarification on the distances between the existing houses and the proposed properties, in particular 13 Turnberry drive and unit 8 and considered the effect on residential amenity.
- Members requested that the condition controlling the insertion of new windows opening be extended to the whole development, to protect the privacy of neighbours.

Members accepted the need for additional housing, including affordable housing, in the city.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report and the additional conditions below.

Additional Condition

Development shall not begin until details of foul and surface water drainage works have been submitted

to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with these details for the proper drainage of the site.

Additional condition

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 in any of the dwellings to which this consent relates

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

Reason: The proposed development would deliver housing, including affordable housing which was the type and need required in the city. The site was suitable for housing and the scheme was acceptable on design grounds. The proposal would introduce a mixed residential scheme in a sustainable location. There would be no adverse effect on highway safety or the amenity of surrounding residents.

**21c) Great Outdoors, Stirling Road, York, YO30 4XY  
(13/01670/FULM)**

Members considered a major full application by Mr David Anderson for a change of use from non food retail (use class A1) to a commercial gym (use class D2) and alterations to existing car park.

Representations were received from Mr Neil Stanton, Operations Director for Roko Health clubs, in objection to the application. He raised the following concerns:

- the proposed levels of vehicle and cycle parking were not sufficient for the projected numbers of customers.
- The bus service information in the report was misleading. The number 6 service stops too far away from the site and the number 20 service finishes at 6pm and does not operate on Sundays.



- Trip data had not been considered.
- There were no parking restrictions on the road itself, so if the car park was full, cars would spill out onto the road causing a potential hazard.

Representations were received from local resident Terry Kettle in objection to the application. He raised concerns regarding traffic volumes in the area and the number of other health clubs in the vicinity and made the following points:

- Traffic around Clifton Moor was already horrendous at peak times. This use would further exacerbate the problem.
- There were already three other health clubs in the vicinity – Roko (approx 50 yards away), Fitness First ( approx 100 yards away) and Atlanta Gym (approx 200-300 yards away) – it was ridiculous that another health club was opening up so close.

Representations were received from Gerard Sweeney, a planning consultant and agent for the application. He advised Members that the gym would operate on a “no contract” basis. Members would pay per month and their membership would be renewable monthly. Therefore if members found problems with the parking they could chose not to renew their membership. With regard to other health clubs in the area, he advised Members that this was purely a gym and studio- with no pool, sauna, steam room facilities or cafe. This therefore provided a different offer to other gyms nearby.

Highways officers confirmed that the applicant had submitted a projected level of membership and their views had been based on these figures which envisaged that there would be approximately 100 members using the venue at any time. The parking provision was considered adequate for the projected level of usage.

Members noted that customer use would be spread throughout the day rather than all being on the premises at once, and that highways had commented and were happy with the proposals based on the projected numbers of customers. They acknowledged that the number of nearby gyms was an issue of commercial competition and not a planning issue which they could consider.

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

Reason: The building to which the application relates was initially constructed in the late 1990s as a night club. Planning permission had been sought for change of use of the building from its most recent use as a retail unit selling outdoor clothing and camping gear to a gym (Use Class D2). A sequential assessment had been submitted which clearly demonstrated that other more appropriate sites did not exist within or within the environs of the City Centre. At the same time despite concerns in respect of over-concentration of similar uses in the vicinity there was no evidence of a particular issue and it was not the role of the planning system to intervene in issues of commercial competition. Additional car and cycle parking would be provided within the adopted maximum standards and there was no evidence that this would not be sufficient to cater for the needs of the proposed use. A Transport Statement had been submitted which demonstrated that any increase in traffic flows to and from the site would not cause demonstrable harm to other road users in the locality. The proposal was therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

**21d) Wills and Ellis Garage, Boroughbridge Road, York,  
YO26 6QD (13/02439/OUT)**

Members considered an outline application by Skelwith Group for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of replacement petrol station with shop and drive-thru restaurant with associated parking and access.

A copy of a letter from Langley's Solicitors, sent on behalf of the owner of one of the two houses immediately adjacent to the application site raising objections to the application, was circulated to Members of the Committee. A copy of a response to this letter from ID Planning on behalf of the applicant, was also circulated to Members.

Officers provided an update on the application. They advised that a Flood Risk Assessment had now been received in response to concerns relating to the level of information in

respect of surface water drainage submitted with the proposal. They noted that the application site lies within Flood Zone 1 which has the lowest defined risk of flooding and is defined within Environment Agency guidance as being for a "less vulnerable use". The built footprint of the site as re-developed would also not be materially different from the existing and any increase in surface water discharges would be minimal.

Officers also advised that seven further representations had been received from properties in the vicinity but that no new issues had been raised.

They also advised that Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) had provided further comments in respect of the air quality impact of the proposal and indicated that they felt the proposal would not give rise to any harm. In respect of the noise impact of the proposal, EPU have also indicated that subject to a number of detailed conditions to safeguard the amenity of the neighbouring property then the proposal would not give rise to any material harm. The following conditions were recommended (and would supersede the recommended conditions 5 and 6)

- Restriction of deliveries to 7:00 to 23:00 Mon – Sat with no deliveries on Sundays or bank holidays.
- Details of all machinery, plant and equipment to be installed in or located on the use hereby permitted which are audible outside of the site boundary when in use, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval.
- All such approved machinery, plant and equipment shall not be used on the site except in accordance with the prior written approval of the local planning authority. The machinery, plant or equipment and any approved noise mitigation measures shall be fully implemented and operational before the proposed use first opens and shall be appropriately maintained thereafter.
- Details of an acoustic noise barrier to protect the residential properties on the south and south eastern boundary of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Officers advised that since the committee report was prepared it had been brought to their attention that the second bungalow within the site which had been identified for demolition if the proposals are implemented was in fact let on a six month lease

to a former employee of the garage. The applicant had confirmed that the tenant was aware of the proposed redevelopment and would be served with the appropriate legal notice to allow the proposal to be implemented.

They also advised that a further, more detailed, letter of objection has been submitted on behalf of the owner of the adjacent bungalow to be retained. This has been circulated separately to Members and raised the following additional issues which had been addressed further below:-

- Concern is expressed over a lack of justification for retention of the petrol station. *However, the petrol station use is historic and there is therefore no requirement to justify its continuance.*
- Concern is also expressed in respect of the impact of the proposal upon the residential amenity of the adjacent property, specifically in respect of noise, cooking smells and potential anti-social behaviour and the lack of mitigation of any impact along the site boundary. *These matters are however dealt with via recommended conditions 4, and 7 along with the recommended conditions from the Environmental Protection Unit.*
- Concern is expressed in relation to the need and justification for the development. *It is suggested that the proposal would give rise to a significant intensification of the use of the site with consequent congestion and impact upon pedestrians. A Transport Assessment has been submitted with the proposal which demonstrates that the proposal would not give rise to a material increase in congestion and there is limited scope for pedestrian access to the site. The proposal has been identified as ancillary to the existing motorist facility and as such the need or otherwise for the proposal is not a material planning consideration.*
- Concern has been expressed in respect of the appropriateness of the proposal within the Green Belt and its impact upon openness. *Within the terms of paragraph 89 of the NPPF the proposal falls within the category of*

*partial or complete re-development of a previously developed site whether redundant or in continuing use. This is taken as appropriate development where it would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it than the existing. The proposal involves the removal of the existing car dealership and car repair functions and the erection of a drive-thru restaurant. The redeveloped site would not be materially different in extent than that existing. The proposed access from the A1237 would impact upon the openness of the Green Belt; however, a significant quantity of landscaping is suggested on the submitted plan.*

Representations were received from Ms Carol Patten, a local resident of Cinder Lane, in objection to the application. She made the following points:

- The new enlarged roundabout should be moved slightly in order to give greater visibility to all properties
- The aim of enlarged roundabout and new Park and Ride was to ease traffic flow on the ring road. These proposals for a drive- thru restaurant would restrict traffic flow on the ring road as traffic entering and leaving the site would have to use the roundabout.
- The entrance to the site was so close to the roundabout it would be dangerous.
- The proposals would have a massive visual impact on a semi rural area.

Officers confirmed that the entry/exit arrangements met both City of York Council's and national standards and explained that these had already been subject to an audit and would be subject to a further audit.

Representations were received from Ms Gilly Adam, another local resident living opposite the garage, in objection to the application. She raised concerns in relation to traffic safety, anti social behaviour (ASB) and increased noise affecting local residents. She made the following points:

- local residents had suffered from ASB at night to a minor degree since the garage has been open 24 hours (as well as littering to her front garden).

- the proposals could lead to an increase in ASB due to the increased volume of customers using the site.

Representations were received from Steven Ellis, the owner of Wills and Ellis, in support of the application. He made the following points:

- The proposed changes would enable him to meet future business needs and provided a solution to guarantee business on the site for years to come.
- Wills and Ellis Service Centre would move to a new location a mile away.
- Car sales had reduced during the last year.
- The built form is much the same as what is currently on site.
- Access to the site needed to be altered due to the new road layout to ensure motorist and pedestrian safety.
- 20 new jobs would be created.
- New restaurant/drive thru and petrol facilities would enable the site to be modernised and visually improved.

Mr Ellis responded to a query from Members regarding incidences of ASB which he confirmed were irregular and provided examples of types of incidents occurring.

He explained that due to the new roundabout being closer to the site, without the altered entrance/exit arrangements, the petrol delivery tanker would not be able to traverse the traffic to enter/exit the site and if he lost the petrol aspect of the business, the entire business would be threatened with closure.

Highways Officers provided further information on the road layout in response to various questions asked by Members and in response to safety concerns which had been raised.

Members agreed that they had no concerns about the petrol station part of the proposal however they recognised concerns regarding proposals for the drive thru- restaurant and the effect on residential amenity. They suggested that the remaining bungalow be screened and security arrangements put in place to ensure the resident felt secure.

Members were reminded that this was an outline application. EPU officers views were that the opening hours of the restaurant would not affect residential amenity and the alternative wording proposed in relation to operating hours was contained in the officer update to committee. Further information would be available once an operator came forward. A further “reserved matters” application would allow members to regulate opening hours.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amended and additional conditions below.

Amended Condition 5

No deliveries shall be taken at or despatched from the drive-thru restaurant or shop hereby authorised outside of the hours of 07:00 to 23:00 Monday to Saturday or at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of local residents and to secure compliance with Policy GP1 of the York Development Control Local Plan.

Amended Condition 6

Prior to the development hereby authorised being commenced details of an acoustic noise barrier to protect the residential properties on the south and south eastern boundary of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include the construction method, height, thickness acoustic properties and the exact position of the barrier. The barrier shall be erected in accordance with the approval before the use hereby permitted first comes into use and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason:- To safeguard the residential amenity of the adjacent property and to secure compliance with Policy GP1 of the York Development Control Local Plan.

Additional Condition

20 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby authorised details of all machinery, plant and equipment to be installed in or located on the development hereby authorised which shall be audible outside of the site boundary when in use, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include the location, maximum sound levels (L<sub>A</sub>mx(f)), average sound levels (L<sub>A</sub>eq), octave band noise levels and any proposed noise mitigation measures. The report shall be conducted in accordance with BS4142:1997. The report shall assess the impact of the additional noise sources on nearby residential properties and include any noise mitigation measures that are required. The approved mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted.

NOTE:- The rating level of plant and machinery should not exceed 31dB(A) inclusive of a 5dB character correction if required under BS4142.

Reason:- To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

#### Additional Condition

21 All such approved machinery, plant and equipment shall not be used on the site except in accordance with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The machinery, plant or equipment and any approved noise mitigation measures shall be fully implemented and operational before the proposed development first opens and shall be appropriately maintained thereafter.

Reason:- To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.



Reason: As a re-development and consolidation of the existing site it was considered that the proposal would be not be inappropriate development in the York Green Belt within the terms outlined in paragraph 89 of the NPPF. It would give rise to no greater impact than the current operation in terms of the residential development to the north. A bungalow did however remain to the south east in close proximity but conditions restricting the operating hours of the facility and requiring the reinforcement of the existing boundary treatment effectively mitigated any impact upon the residential amenity of that property At the same time the reconfiguration of the site access to gain entry from the A1237 Outer Ring Road and exit on to the A59 Boroughbridge Road would significantly improve conditions for local highway users when compared with the existing situation. The proposal was therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

**21e) 2-16 Piccadilly, York (13/02559/FULM)**

Members considered a major full application by Mr and Mrs A Graham for a change of use of existing ground floor retail units to either retail (Class A1), office (class A2), restaurant/café (class A3) or drinking establishment (class A4) including extensions to the rear, change of use of upper floors from hotel to residential accommodation (class C3) to form 18 new apartments, external alterations and associated works.

Officers advised that an additional condition should be included to deal with screening to air-conditioning units, if these were needed on the rear roof.

With regard to proposed condition 7 (landscaping) officers advised the Committee that it was no longer proposed to have residential access to the flat roof area at the rear. The applicants would prefer not to be required to landscape this area due to costs (installation & maintenance). Officers noted that whilst landscaping of the area would be desirable for future residents the condition was not necessary (there would be no wider public benefit and the scheme would not be unacceptable

without landscaping). As such officers accepted that the condition could be deleted.

They also advised that they had received revised plans which included minor revisions which had been agreed detailing of the shop front (affecting unit 1). They advised that these changes would visually improve the shop front by reducing the amount of glazing around the ATM in order to discourage advertising posters from being displayed.

Members were advised that the variety of uses was in order to enable an element of flexibility and that these uses could be controlled by relevant conditions.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report, the amendment to condition 2 (plans), the deletion of condition 7 (landscaping) and the additional condition regarding screening of the air conditioning unit.

#### Amended Condition 2

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

Floor plans - 045A, 046C, 009D, 010D, 011E, 050C

Elevations - 051D, 052A, 053, 054A, 055A, 069

Large scale details 067B, 68B, 69A, 70A and 71

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

#### Additional Condition

External plant

Details of how any plant to be installed on the flat roof area at the rear shall be screened from view (from surrounding residential units) shall be approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation of the plant. The screening shall be installed in accordance with

the approved details and reasonably maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Reason: The proposals would help meet identified housing need, providing accommodation in a sustainable location and through conditions residential amenity for future occupants would be adequate. The proposals would bring the building back into use and improve the appearance of the conservation area.

## **21f) 1 Allendale, York, YO24 2SF**

Members considered a full application by Mrs Margaret Gosling for a single storey side extension.

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

Reason: It was considered that the proposed extension would not have any detrimental impact upon the character of the area or neighbouring residential amenity.

## **22. Urgent Business**

Further to concerns raised by Members at the meeting on 4 July 2013 (Minute 12 refers) with regard to the accuracy of information on Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) which was available to them when considering planning applications. At this meeting it had been agreed that the chair of the Area Planning Sub-Committee should liaise with the Assistant Director for City Development and Sustainability and the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning and Sustainability with regard to the collation of HMO information.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the following information to Members:

- A summary of HMO Decisions since Article 4 direction came into force (20/04/12)
- HMO Appeal Decisions
- Summary of Database now being used to calculate HMO concentrations for planning applications for changes of use from Class C3 (dwellinghouse) to houses in multiple occupation.

Members were advised that the Council Tax Student Exemptions database was updated on a yearly basis, and had been done so in May of this year, but that case officers were advised to contact Council Tax regarding any new planning applications in order to obtain the most up-to-date information.

Members agreed that the summary of HMO decisions was useful but asked that it be broken down to Ward level.

Resolved: That the information provided be noted.

Reason: In order that Members are kept informed regarding the collation of information on HMOs.

Councillor N McIlveen, Chair

[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 5.10 pm].