**BARWICK in ELMET & SCHOLES PARISH COUNCIL: PLANNING COMMITTEE** meeting held at 6:30pm on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2023 in the Miner's Institute, Barwick in Elmet

**PRESENT**: Councillors Alexandra Cantelo, Jacqueline Ward and Karen Dales.

In Attendance: One resident and the Clerk

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: None.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST: None.

## 3 PUBLIC PARTICIPTATION

There was one member of the public in attendance who had concerns about 18 Flats Lane. He had attended the Planning Committee meeting when this application was first discussed. Since then, the applicant had submitted revised plans. The member of the public in attendance did not feel that the revised plans addressed the previously expressed concerns. He advised the Committee that the dispute with the neighbour about the boundary line (which he had raised the last time he came to a Committee meeting) was now resolved. He disputed the accuracy of some of the plans, in particular an apple tree incorrectly showing on his side of the boundary and the roofline of house number 16 being incorrectly shown as one continuous line when in fact it was lower than the existing roof. He noted that most of the existing properties on this side of Flats Lane were either semi or detached bungalows and that the proposed three-bedroom, two-bathroom proposals were not in keeping with the street scene. The revised proposals moved the extension back a foot from the boundary, but he still had concerns about the close proximity to his property. The extension was going forward a metre and a half from the front of the building line and as a result he would only be able to see the extension and not the road. There used to be a non-opening facing window, the proposed extension facing window would be able to be opened and the resident had concerns about resulting noise and interference (the Chair suggested modern fire regulations might require the window to be able to be opened as an egress in case of emergency). The resident had observed fire extinguishers regularly being left out for collection and felt that the applicant was running a business from his home. Plans showing the effects of overshadowing on neighbouring properties reflected the situation on the longest day of the year, the resident felt that this was therefore not a true reflection of the effects of overshadowing. He complained about the lack of privacy since the boundary hedge had been taken down and was considering putting eco-fencing up to block any view from the facing window but was unable to do so whilst the tree stumps from the hedge were still in place (these would be taken out if permission was granted). He and the neighbour at 16 had submitted comments to the Local Planning Authority in response to the revised plans. His comments were showing on the Leeds City Council (LCC) planning portal but those of number 16 were not. He had exchanged emails with the Clerk about this. LCC had confirmed receipt of comments from both neighbours and stated that the need to redact was the reason why only one had appeared so far and confirmed that the other would also appear in due course, however at the time of the meeting, the comments submitted by number 16 were still not showing.

**MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**: It was **resolved** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2023 having been circulated, be approved and that the Chair sign the minutes.

## 5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS:

The following applications were considered;

| Application number & date  | Applicant             | Description   |  |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| 22/08245/FU  | 18 Flats Lane         | Alterations and extensions to existing bungalow including re-roof, front, side and rear single storey extensions  |  |
| The Committee noted the comments made about this application in the public participation (see above) and agreed to re-submit their original comments amended where necessary to reflect the revised proposals.   |                       |   |  |
| 23/01551/FU<br>20 March 2023   | 10 The Avenue         | Demolition of garage; outbuilding to rear; steps and raised platform area with handrail to rear   |  |
| Consideration was given to the height of the proposed outbuilding and the effect on the next-door neighbour. It was noted that there was nothing in the application regarding plumbing. The outbuilding would be a garden room with utilities. The Committee agreed to raise <b>no objection</b> to this proposal.   |                       |   |  |
| 23/01196/FU/NE<br>21 March 2023  | 33 Richmondfield Lane | Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two detached dwellings  |  |
| The Committee had several concerns about this proposal. They felt that this was overdevelopment as the size of the plot was too small to support two detached dwellings (the view was that the plot was only large enough for a single dwelling). They felt that this was an incongruous design with minimal gardens, inadequate space for car parking (a four bedroomed property would need space for at least two vehicles) and concerns about the boundary. As such, the Committee decided to <b>object</b> as it felt unable to support this application for the reasons stated.   |                       |   |  |
| 23/02002/FU/NE<br>29 March 2023  | 37 Potterton Lane     | Alterations including conversion of existing outbuilding to form a garage at ground floor level and study/hobby room at first floor level; juliet balcony window to front |  |
| It was noted that this was on the boundary with 6 Meadow View and 39 Potterton Lane and that there had been objections from the former. The Juliet balcony would be at the front. There was already a dormer window. The proposal included a shower downstairs and there looked to be a sink upstairs (marked as "drinks" on the plans). The proposals would involve building over the outbuilding and would make the outbuilding more like habitable accommodation. There was already a first-floor level. The Committee felt unable to support the application in its current format and therefore decided to <b>object</b> to what was proposed |                       |   |  |

| 23/01799/FU/NE 17   |                       |   |  |  |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| 00 Manala 0000  | Leeds Road, Barwick   | Alterations to all elevations of existing house including already approved side and |  |  |
| 30 March 2023 In E  | Elmet                 | rear extensions to a white render finish and new pitched roof to existing garage to |  |  |
|   |                       | side  |  |  |
| It was noted that there had been an objection to this application from a neighbour who felt that they had not been properly consulted by the  |                       |   |  |  |
| Local Planning Authority. The Committee noted that when the extension had been built, it had not been possible to match the bricks to those   |                       |   |  |  |
| of the original property suggesting that this was the reason why the applicant was considering rendering. Although the Committee had no       |                       |   |  |  |
| objections to the rendering at the rear (which would not be visible from the public highway) they did have concerns that the rendering at the |                       |   |  |  |
| front what have an adverse effect on the street scene and therefore felt unable to support what had been proposed and therefore objected      |                       |   |  |  |
| to this application.  |                       |   |  |  |
| l '   | _yndhurst Close       | Installation of double gates, single gate and render wall with close boarded timber |  |  |
| 31 March 2023   |                       | panels to front entrance  |  |  |
| The Committee noted that the proposed height of the gates was 1600mm (just over five feet) and felt that there was no need for gates of this  |                       |   |  |  |
| height at the top end of the cul-de-sac and felt that a height of no more than four feet would be acceptable. As such the Committee did not   |                       |   |  |  |
| feel able to support this application and agreed to <b>object</b> for the reasons stated.   |                       |   |  |  |
| 23/01743/FU/NE 44   | Station Road          | Erection of detached wooden gazebo to rear, incorporating aluminium roof            |  |  |
| 3 April 2023  |                       |   |  |  |
| The Committee agreed to raise <b>no objection</b> to this proposal.   |                       |   |  |  |
| 23/9/00083/MOD 18   | Gascoigne Road        | Single storey rear extension; new door with window to side and replacement of all   |  |  |
| 5 April 2023  | -                     | existing windows NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/05406/FU Updated                      |  |  |
|   |                       | internal layout to proposed extension which impacts on external fenestration        |  |  |
| After clarification of the terminology, the Committee agreed to raise <b>no objection</b> to the proposed amendments to this application.     |                       |   |  |  |
| 23/02068/FU/NE 88   | & 90 Main Street,     | Single storey rear extensions on both properties 88 & 90 plus a single storey side  |  |  |
| 6 April 2023 Sch  | holes                 | extension on number 88.   |  |  |
| After noting that there would be no adverse effect on car parking and that there were porches on the front, the Committee agreed to raise no  |                       |   |  |  |
| objection to this application.  |                       |   |  |  |
|   | 2 Leeds Road, Barwick | Single storey side and rear extension   |  |  |
| 6 April 2023 In E   | Elmet                 |   |  |  |
| The narrow size of this plot of land and small garden size was noted, and it was noted that this property had been extended previously. It    |                       |   |  |  |
| was also noted that the next-door neighbour had extended their property dramatically. The proposed side extension was set well back from      |                       |   |  |  |
| the front of the property, the proposal did not go right up to the boundary line, it was single storey and there were no windows. The         |                       |   |  |  |
| Committee therefore agreed to raise <b>no objection</b> to this application.  |                       |   |  |  |

## 6. OTHER MATTERS

- **a.** Update on removal of wall on Leeds Road reported to Planning Enforcement on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2022 Case Ref 22/00681/UOPS2 There was nothing new to report.
- **b.** Concerns that the chicken farm on Long Lane is being used for storage of scrap vehicles Case Ref 22/01065/UCU3 It was noted that the vehicles were not necessarily scrap, there was some uncertainty about whether the vehicles were still there. Additionally, there was concern about a new structure at the same location, the Clerk would pursue this with LCC Planning Compliance.
- c. Concerns from a resident about 15 Gascoigne Avenue. A resident, whose property adjoined 15 Gascoigne Avenue was upset about the adverse effect on her property caused by the ongoing building of her next door neighbour, in particular, the amount of cement from the brick works over her drive and plastered on her kitchen window and door. It was felt that this should be reported to LCC.
- **d.** Concerns about the demolition, site clearance and construction works at 'The Rectory' Main Street Barwick In Elmet. The Committee noted that a considerable amount of waste material was being burnt on site. Online checks were done to see if there were any bylaws regarding bonfires and it was established that there were no rules regarding the time of day that a bonfire could be lit. Regarding the specific complaint that the entrance wall had been widened, the Committee concluded that it was lawful to do for access purposes during construction as long as the wall was fully restored once the work was complete.

## 7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

3rd May 2023 at 6:30pm in Saint Philip's Church Hall, Scholes.

The meeting closed at 8:15pm

Signed

Chair 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2023