

**MINUTES of the PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING of  
BURLEY PARISH COUNCIL**

held on Monday 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010  
at Queen's Hall, Burley in Wharfedale

**Present:** Councillors P Jenkins (Chairman), K Dale, J Horton, C Jones, P Riley, S Tilford & M Walker  
Clerk: Mrs J Griffiths

**P242/0910 Chairman's Remarks**

Cllr Jenkins opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. Councillors were invited to think about conditions attached to planning recommendations; the committee had the ability to recommend conditions and these help ensure that applications are built to the plans.

Cllr Jenkins offered an update on application 09/06010/HOU – Middle Lodge, the application had not been referred to the next meeting of the Planning Panel. There was as yet, no decision on application 09/06206/HOU – Homestead, Moor Road.

**P243/0910 Apologies**

Cllr Forrest had sent apologies; these were received and accepted.

**P244/0910 Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Horton declared a personal interest in application 10/00997/HOU – 7 Norwood Terrace.

**P245/0910 Motion to defer public participation**

Proposed by Cllr Jenkins

Seconded by Cllr Jones

RESOLVED to defer public participation until later in the meeting.

**P246/0910 Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> March 2010. It was proposed by Cllr Walker and seconded by Cllr Horton that the minutes were a true and accurate record and accepted accordingly.

**P247/0910 Clerk's Report**

The clerk reported she had sent a letter to Peter Bridgman, Area Planning Officer outlining a number of concerns and questions the planning committee had in regard to the planning process.

The clerk had spoken to one of the Enforcement Officers who had advised that application 10/00383/HOU – 20 Hasley Road had been refused by the planning officers.

**P248/0910 Planning applications:**

**10/00729/HOU – 17 Menston Old Lane**

*Construction of two storey side extension/amendments to approved application  
08/05198/FUL*

Cllr Jenkins displayed the photographs and reminded councillors of the earlier applications at this site. The committee had received a letter from the residents of 15 Menston Old Lane requesting a condition, regarding the windows on the norther elevation of thje property, is inserted on any approval.

*Cllr Jenkins stopped the meeting to allow public participation*

The applicants and their architect spoke in support of the application and advised that the footprint of the proposed development was very similar to the application approved in 2008

(08/05198/FUL). The main difference between this application and the previously approved application was that the garage would now be attached to the house rather than separate. The retaining wall proposed for the garden is to allow vehicle access rather than as a flood defence measure. The applicants had sought pre-application advice from planning officers who had signalled their satisfaction with the proposal and the flood assessment information provided. The applicants asserted that the height of the proposed development would not adversely impact the street scene as the property is set back and lower than the road level. It is also similar in size and scope to the extension at 15 Menston Old Lane.

The residents of 19 Menston Old Lane were present to offer their objection to the proposal. It was their assertion that the proposal was very similar to the application that had been refused (09/05587/HOU) and again objected on the grounds that: the proposed building would be too big in relation to the original property; the development would cover an area of land that does flood and the impact on this and other properties in the area would be detrimental – the water displaced would raise the level elsewhere; the development would have an adverse impact on a number of mature trees.

*Cllr Jenkins re-started the meeting*

The committee discussed the information provided and it was

**Resolved: recommend refusal on the grounds that:**

- **the proposed extension would represent over development in relation to the original property;**
- **given the known history of the nearby water course (Mickle Ing Beck) and the likelihood of flooding at this property and the surrounding area that the information provided re: flood risk is not sufficient: neither requirement for the ground floor levels to be set at 300mm above the known or modelled 1 in 100 annual probability flood level, nor the effect on other properties of the restriction to the water course by the side extension, have been addressed. The committee strongly recommends a full Flood Risk Assessment is carried out.**

### **10/00705/HOU – 3 Greenfields Way**

*Front extension to form garage, porch and shower room*

*Cllr Jenkins stopped the meeting to allow public participation*

The resident of 1 Greenfields Way was present to offer his objection to the proposed development. The development would be out of keeping with the existing street scene. The proposed garage would be intrusive and overshadowing on 1 Greenfields Way. The provision of parking spaces in the front garden would substantially increase the amount of hard standing in the area which could have an adverse impact on the water levels at this and neighbouring properties.

*Cllr Jenkins re-started the meeting*

**Resolved: recommend refusal on the grounds that:**

- **the proposed development would be over dominant on this site and would be out of keeping with the street scene by sitting forward of the property;**
- **combined with the hard standing for parking spaces it would also represent over development of the front garden;**
- **the development would adversely impact the appearance of the symmetrical properties at 1 & 3 Greenfields Way to the detriment of the street scene;**
- **the proposed development would overshadow and adversely impact the residents of 1 Greenfields Way.**

**The committee also noted that the plans omitted the existing hedge between 1 and 3 Greenfields Way and the two silver birch trees currently sited in the front garden.**

**10/00991/HOU – 2 Old Mill Close**

*Construction of second storey extension*

*Cllr Jenkins stopped the meeting to allow public participation*

The resident of 24 Long Meadows was present to offer an objection to the proposed development as it would bring the gable much closer to his own property and spoil the enjoyment of his garden and be overly intrusive on the property. It was his assertion that the distances laid down between properties when they were constructed would be breached if the gable was to extend as currently proposed.

*Cllr Jenkins re-started the meeting*

**Resolved: recommend refusal on the grounds that the proposed development would be over dominant on 24 Long Meadows and breaches the distances between properties set down at the time of the development**

**10/01015/HOU & 10/01014/LBC – 40 Main Street**

*New railings on Main Street frontage & Internal and external alterations to existing building with new railings on Main St frontage*

**Resolved: recommend approval but with the condition that the railings installed replicate the original railings as shown on the photograph already sent to the Conservation Officers. A further copy is to be forwarded with this recommendation.**

**10/00997/HOU – 7 Norwood Terrace**

*Construction of two storey side extension*

**Resolved: recommend approval with the condition that slate tiles are used for the roofing material**

**10/00957/HOU – Skelda House, 4 Holme Grove**

*Construction of two storey side extension*

**Resolved: recommend approval**

**P249/0910 To note decisions by BMDC planning**  
*09/06055/FUL – Carr Bottom Filter Station – Approved*

**P250/0910 To note withdrawal of the following applications**  
*10/00094/FUL – Black Bull Farm, Ilkley Road*  
*10/00093/LBC - Black Bull Farm, Ilkley Road*

**P251/0910 Enforcement Issues**  
The clerk had forwarded concerns re: construction at 3 Bare Rhydding Cottages to the Enforcement Officer. Cllr Jenkins had spoken to the Enforcement Officer who had advised they would not be taking any action as retention of the hedge, although strongly confirmed in the Design and Access Statement, was not a condition of the planning approval. In addition proposed south elevation was so poorly drawn that it was impossible to tell whether the height of the new extension was higher than specified. The Enforcement Officer's assertion was that the development was being built to plans.

**P252/0910 Certificates of Lawfulness**  
None

**P253/0910 Minor Items for action by the clerk between meetings and items for the next agenda**

Cllr Jenkins requested purchase of a 8GB memory stick to store plans/photos on. A proposal for plan hangers would be forwarded to the clerk for inclusion in the office refurbishment plan.

**P254/0910 Date of next Planning Committee meetings:** Mondays 19<sup>th</sup> April & 10<sup>th</sup> May 2010