

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

www.bradford.gov.uk

(mins.dot)

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley) held on Thursday 10 July 2008 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 1005
Adjourned 1150
Reconvened 1155
Adjourned 1610
Reconvened 1615
Concluded 1638

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR
Greaves	Shamin Akhtar
Hill	Rowen
Owens	

Apologies were received from Councillors Ellis and Lee.

Ward Councillors present: M Smith and R Payne

Councillor Greaves in the Chair

13. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Greaves disclosed a personal interest in Minutes 19, 20 and 22 for matters relating to Elim House, Wharfe View Road, Ilkley and "Southwood", 51 Curly Hill, Ilkley as he had been contacted by the applicants and had forwarded the e-mail to the appropriate person but had made no comment himself. As the interest was not prejudicial he took full part in the discussion and voting on these items.

Councillors Rowen and Shamin Akhtar disclosed a personal interest in Minute 24 for matters relating to 13 Grafton Road, Keighley as they had received calls from the applicant but had made no comments. As the interest was not prejudicial they took full part in the discussion and voting on this item.

Councillor Ellis disclosed a personal interest in Minute 18 for matters relating to The Croft, Hill House Lane, Oxenhope as he had a connection with the land in question, but as the interest was not prejudicial he took full part in the discussion and voting on this item.



2006-2007
Improving Rural Services
Empowering Communities



Suzan Hemingway, Assistant Director Corporate Services (City Solicitor)



Councillor Hill disclosed a personal interest in Minutes 19 and 20 for matters relating to Elim House, Wharfe View Road, Ilkley as he had received an e-mail in respect of the application but had made no comments, and as the interest was not prejudicial he took full part in the discussion and voting on this item.

ACTION: *Director of Corporate Services (City Solicitor)*

14. **MINUTES**

Resolved -

That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 April 2008 be signed as a correct record.

15. **INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents.

16. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

17. **DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

APPEALS ALLOWED

(i) **6 CRYER MEADOWS, HAWORTH**

Worth Valley

Decking – 07/04132/FUL.

(ii) **THE ROEBUCK, 372 SKIPTON ROAD, KEIGHLEY**

Keighley Central

Construction of covered timber terrace to form smoking shelter - 07/08906/FUL.

APPEALS DISMISSED

(iii) **4 SYKE SIDE, UTLEY, KEIGHLEY**

Keighley Central

Conservatory to rear – 07/08902/FUL.

(iv) **31 WELLINGTON ROAD, ILKLEY**

Ilkley

Dormer and new first floor window to front (east) elevation
- 07/0481/FUL.

(v) **FORMER SCRAP YARD, LAND AT BECKS ROAD,
RAGLAN STREET**

Keighley West

Residential development – 07/00494/OUT.

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

18. THE CROFT, HILL HOUSE LANE, OXENHOPE

Worth Valley

Full planning application for retrospective replacement of loose box railway carriage with stables at The Croft, Hill House Lane, Oxenhope, Keighley – 08/01387/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that the Parish Council had commented that they had no objections in principle to the application and noted the close proximity of the access to the property and that the stables should be nearer to the road. It was prudent to condition that the use of the stables be restricted to the occupier of The Croft, Hill House Lane, Oxenhope.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the principle of stabling in this location was acceptable. The siting, design, external appearance was acceptable and it was not considered that there was a detrimental impact on visual and residential amenity, traffic flow and highway safety and community safety issues. As such the proposal was in accordance with Policies D1, UR3, TM2 and D4 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended that subject to conditions the application be approved.

Members raised matters on the stables not being used commercially and applying a condition granting personal permission to the occupier of The Croft.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report and the following additional condition:

- (i) That a personal permission be granted to the occupier of The Croft, Hill House Lane, Oxenhope and that the stables is not used as a commercial operation.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

19. ELIM HOUSE, WHARFE VIEW ROAD, ILKLEY

Ilkley

Full planning application for demolition of existing house and the construction of 4 new dwellings at Elim House, Wharfe View Road, Ilkley – 08/00179/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout and he reported that the Parish Council had recommended

refusal of the application due to lack of information, distance to habitable room windows on Leicester Crescent opposite, the height in relation to properties to the east and opposite, and loss of street parking. Eleven objections had been received, plus one from a Ward Councillor requesting consideration of the application by the Area Planning Panel.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the site presented an opportunity for higher density housing at an accessible location in Ilkley Town Centre. The existing house was of no significant architectural or historic merit and was considered to make no significant contribution to the street scene. The proposed replacement development had been redesigned to reflect the character and scale of traditional buildings elsewhere along Wharfe View Road and Castle Road and was now considered to be sympathetic to the character and scale of neighbouring buildings and the siting and height had been redesigned to have no significant adverse effects on the living conditions of adjoining neighbours. The proposal was considered to achieve a higher density of housing whilst preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of this part of Ilkley Conservation Area and had no significant adverse effects on neighbours. The proposal was considered to accord with Policies UR3, BH9, D1 and BH7 of the Unitary Development Plan and guidance on demolition set out in PPG15 on "Planning and the Historic Environment". He therefore recommended that subject to conditions the application be approved.

Members made the following comments:

- The carport openings should be replaced by garages with doors.
- Would the chimney be a real chimney?
- Was it in character with some of the larger Victorian properties.
- There would be some parking problems.

A statement from the residents of Wharfe View Road was submitted at the meeting of the Panel. In conclusion the statement outlined that the proposed replacements to Elim House added nothing positive to the conservation area. The residents of Wharfe View Road objected to the bulk, height and position of the proposed development and to the traffic and parking problems and believed that the proposal would have significant negative effects upon neighbours. They would prefer Elim House to be restored and enjoyed.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- He had objected in February 2008 at the proposed scale of the development and indicated that it was inappropriate.
- Planning officers had made an error in respect of this development.
- The scale was wrong in relation to the street scene.
- It was not appropriate to the conservation area.
- There should be garage doors rather than carport openings.
- Two storeys was more appropriate in keeping with the surrounding area.
- Access to the development would be a problem as vehicles tended to be parked on both sides of the road.
- Expressed concern about the height of units 2 and 3 and they also looked a bit odd.

A Parish Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- Ilkley Parish Council had serious concerns about the proposed development.
- It should be possible to restore Elim House and build only one house.
- The proposed development would be too dominant.

- It would affect the visual amenity of residents at Leicester Crescent.
- Wharfe View Road was a busy road and a number of vehicles tended to reverse onto the main road.
- Welcomed the inclusion of a sympathetic boundary treatment.
- The development would have a domineering effect on local residents.

An objector was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- Elim House was an early Edwardian building which added to the character of the area.
- The arguments for demolition were based on the view that the proposed development was better than the current structure.
- The carports were not in keeping with the area.
- It was a tall development and taller than the development at Leicester Crescent.
- There would be parking problems and there was an important issue of traffic safety with residents often reversing onto the main street.
- The area at the gable end was six times larger than the present Elim House.

The agent for the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- He appreciated the time and effort put in by objectors and the applicant had taken a lot of time and effort to see how this development would fit in with the conservation area.
- Research had been carried out on neighbouring properties and also in respect of the properties east of the development which were in line with the existing terraces.
- It would be a modern day building and the height of the buildings were less than a Victorian dwelling.
- A chimney had been included as it would be in character with the area.
- Efforts had been made to ensure that the development was in character with the surrounding area.
- He was a resident of the area himself and appreciated the concerns of objectors.
- He confirmed that the chimneys would be working chimneys.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report and the following conditions:

- (i) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning) to approve an amended plan that shows the carport openings replaced by garages with doors.**
- (ii) That the suggested condition regarding retention of the garages be amended to ensure that the garages are not to be used as habitable rooms or for any other purpose.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

20. ELIM HOUSE, WHARFE VIEW ROAD, ILKLEY**Ilkley**

Conservation Area Consent application to permit a demolition of the existing house to facilitate the construction of 4 new dwellings at Elim House, Wharfe View Road, Ilkley – 08/00180/CAC.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that the Parish Council had recommended refusal of the application. They considered that Elim House should be kept. Objection letters had been received from eleven addresses and the companion planning application. Several opposed demolition of Elim House. A statement from residents of Wharfe View Road was also submitted at the meeting of the Panel (as outlined in minute 19).

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that Elim House makes a neutral contribution to the character or appearance of this part of Ilkley Conservation Area. The application submission was now considered to contain sufficient justification for its demolition so as to facilitate a replacement development that, as amended, was sympathetically designed and would make a greater contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The demolition was considered acceptable having regard to Policies BH9, D1 and BH7 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and guidance in PPG15 on "Planning and the Historic Environment". He therefore recommended that subject to conditions conservation area consent should be granted to the applicant.

A Parish Councillor was present at the meeting and made the same points as outlined in Minute 19. An objector was present at the meeting and made the same points as outlined in Minute 19.

The agent to the applicant was present at the meeting and made the same points as outlined in Minute 19.

Resolved –

That Conservation Area Consent be granted to permit the demolition of the existing house to facilitate the construction of 4 new dwellings at Elim House, Wharfe View Road, Ilkley for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

21. 'STONECROFT', TURNER LANE, ADDINGHAM**Craven**

Full planning application to demolish existing bungalow and redevelop site for two pairs of semi-detached houses, land at 'Stonecroft', Turner Lane, Addingham – 08/01003/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that Addingham Parish Council had recommended refusal of the application and would support two dwellings but objected to this plan as over-development and out of character with the surrounding area. Additional access on the corner would be potentially dangerous and with four families there would be problems with sewage infrastructure. Nine objections from occupiers of neighbouring homes had been received. A Ward Councillor had requested the application be referred to the Area

Planning Panel for determination. The summary of representations received were as outlined in Document "C".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed development, as amended, was considered to be sympathetically related to the surrounding pattern of development and was appropriately designed to respect the context of the site, the character and appearance of this part of Addingham. Amendments were considered to have overcome concerns regarding the design and height of the development and its impact on the amenity of neighbours. It was not considered that four dwellings would have any significant highway safety implications, and parking and access arrangements were considered satisfactory. The proposed development was considered to meet the requirements of relevant Policies TM12, TM19A, D1 and UR3 of the Replacement UDP. He therefore recommended that subject to conditions the application be approved.

A Ward Councillor had objected to the application and made the following points:

- The proposed structure was out of character with the surrounding area as it was a three storey structure.
- The adjacent bungalow window faced a habitable room.
- It was the wrong type of development as it was an attempt to build a three storey block and shoe-horn an extra storey on what should only be a two storey building.
- He recommended that a site visit take place if the photographs provided were not adequate.
- He stressed the importance of the vegetation to screen the properties.

A Parish Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- It was not an acceptable development in the village.
- The Parish Council was not objecting to the land being used for housing but in the way that it was proposed to be used by the applicant.
- She recommended that a site visit take place.
- There was no pavement on the development.
- The trees on the development were dangerous and they were a serious problem.
- There was a danger of vehicles backing out of the development. The road was a country lane and the development would increase the possibility of danger on the road.
- Buses and waste collection vehicles would not be able to get around the t-junction as there would be parked cars in that area.
- The tree trunks were huge and would cause a lot of problems.
- The road does not lead anywhere and it was used by elderly persons, people with children and also dog owners.
- There was not much amenity space in the area.
- There would be drainage problems and four houses in this area were completely unacceptable.

An objector was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- Most of the residents of Turner Lane had objected to the development.
- Four large family houses was too large a development for this area.
- Four houses in this area would be incongruous.
- The development would increase the number of residents of Turner Lane by 60%.
- The application does not meet PP3 or PD1 of the RUDP.
- Six tree preservation orders had been placed on trees at the Stonecroft site to

- maintain the integrity of the trees.
- The sycamore tree should be retained.
- The development was not in character with the surrounding area and would lead to loss of light on neighbouring properties.

The agent for the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- The scheme was designed to suit the site and was set from the back garden.
- The development would enhance the area.
- There was a four metre distance between the proposed houses.
- There was a variety of styles of houses in Addingham.
- The development was within government guidelines in respect of proposed density.
- High quality materials would be used.
- Rather than having a dead wall area a garage and kitchen area had been proposed.
- The development had the mass of a two storey building.
- It was important to construct more modern high quality houses.
- The development complied with planning policy.

Members made the following comments:

- Some of the members of the Panel had previously undertaken a site visit to the area in respect of a different issue.
- The effect of the loss of height has been considered by the Panel.
- It had been indicated by objectors that this matter would be taken to the Local Government Ombudsman and this application can only be considered on its own merits and with the information presented to the Panel.
- The existing bungalow was just over four foot higher.
- It was nice to see a development that was using good materials.
- The parking issues had been considered and there was no problem in respect of this issue.
- The sycamore should be removed and another should not be planted.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to Members and objectors' comments and made the following points:

- If the trees were retained then the character of the area would not be unduly affected.
- Most of the trees would be retained and there was a condition requiring replacement planting.
- The effect of loss of height had been considered.
- He agreed that it was inappropriate to indicate that if the Panel approved the application this matter would be taken to the Local Government Ombudsman and this application could only be considered on its own merits and in light of the information presented to the Panel.
- The existing bungalow was just over four foot higher.
- Obscured glass should be used for the downstairs and upstairs landing windows of the property next to Homewood.
- British and native species should be used for scrub and tree planting to boundaries shown on the approved layout.
- All parking in the driveway areas of the development should have permeable

surfaces.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report and the following additional conditions:

- (i) That obscured glass be used for the downstairs and upstairs landing windows of the property next to Homewood.**
- (ii) That British native species be used for shrub and tree planting to boundaries shown on the approved layout.**
- (ii) That all parking and driveway areas of the development will have permeable surfaces.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

22. 'SOUTHWOOD', 51 CURLY HILL, ILKLEY

Ilkley

Full planning application for extensions and alterations to the existing house and construction of two additional houses in the grounds of 'Southwood', 51 Curly Hill, Middleton, Ilkley – 08/01285/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that Ilkley Parish Council had recommended approval of the application but had expressed concerns about hard surfaced areas near the watercourse and the gatehouse study overlooking the nearest neighbour. Eight objection letters (from seven local addresses and the Ilkley Civic Society) had been received. The summary representations received were as outlined in Document "C".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed development would achieve more effective use of the site for housing in a form that was compatible with the local townscape and landscape context. Subject to compliance with the amended drawings, the design and materials of the two new houses and the extension of the existing house were considered sympathetic and, due to the presence of significant vegetation screening which would be retained and enhanced by the proposals, the development would have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the Middleton Conservation Area. There would be no significant adverse effects on the living conditions of adjoining neighbours sufficient to justify refusal of permission. The proposal was in accordance with Policies D1, D5, BH7, H5, NR16, TM12, TM19A and UR3 of the Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended that subject to conditions the application be approved.

Members made the following comments:

- There was the issue of overlooking between the existing house and two new properties.
- The Panel approved of the application.
- A native species should be included in the native hedging mix and woodland hedge mix of the revised landscaping scheme with 40% of the remaining planting should

be a locally native species listed in the Natural History Museum's Postcode Plants Database.

- Where possible the driveway and parking surfaces of the existing house and new houses should have permeable surfaces.
- Supported the use of the Natural History Museum's Postcode Plants Database and it should be made available to Panel Members and the Strategic Director, Regeneration should be requested to promote its use.

An objector was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- He was speaking on behalf of several objectors.
- There was an issue of land stability and some of the other residents in the area had suffered from subsidence during the Spring, these problems had occurred due to the continuous wet weather.
- The geographical area of Middleton had been subject to land slippage a long time ago.
- Two new houses would increase the building density.
- Low density housing would contribute to the character of Middleton.
- There was a herd of Roe deer which had to be protected against encroachment.
- The planned construction does not comply with the Arts and Guild housing and neighbouring properties guidelines.
- The gatehouse and tower seem to have been added as an afterthought.

An agent for the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- The proposal had been developed over many months and a number of supplementary reports and information had been provided to planning, conservation area, highways, drainage and also landscape officers. This had resulted in each being satisfied with the application.
- The Parish Council also supported the application.
- The culvert would be moved to the driveway side of the house where it will re-join the existing watercourse.
- A new development can increase the speed of water run-off and thus surge the watercourse. This has been avoided in the proposed design as the grass roof slows down the outflow, all pavings proposed would be porous and return that water to the ground and all gutters would be connected to substantial grey water storage tanks in each property. This not only reduces the use of mains water for flushing toilets but also reduces the surface water outfall volume by that amount.
- In effect the outflow from the site will be slower and the volume less.
- The development has been intentionally designed for the gatehouse to recess into the hillside and to be unobtrusive to its neighbours.
- It was proposed to enforce the boundary screen planting as well as introducing additional trees to the site.
- The existing Juniper, which was a low ground spreading species, would be replaced in the boundary with the species of Juniper with better vertical growth and screening.
- He declared a personal interest as he was hoping to build the gatehouse for his family home.
- At his meetings with the neighbours in January, they no more want me to see them as I want them to see me. It is in both our interests that this planting scheme is robust and privacy preserved to a very high level.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to Members and objectors' comments and made the following points:

- There were adequate turning areas on the site.
- Middleton Woods abutted onto the development and in relation to biodiversity it was important to prevent anything coming from the gardens to the wood.
- There had been an amendment in respect of boundary treatment and it was supposed to have a hedge, local and native species as well as a non-native exotic feature.
- Forty per cent of the remaining planting should be locally native species listed in the Natural History Museum's Postcode Plants Database and this should be an additional condition.
- It was not possible to control what people planted in their own gardens.
- There was no evidence of subsistence on the site and there was a condition in respect of this issue.
- In respect of density there was more development but the houses were set away from the public area and would not be intrusive.
- No objections have been raised in the Council's conservation team.
- The tower had not been thrown in as an afterthought but had been carefully considered.
- The purpose of the conservation area was not to say no to all development but to help to ensure that good design and quality materials were used.
- Conservation officers had approved the design.

Resolved –

- (1) That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report and the following additional conditions:**
 - (i) That the Strategic Director, Regeneration be authorised to resolve, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, the issue of overlooking of the development.**
 - (ii) That notwithstanding the proposed native species included in the Native Hedging Mix and Woodland Hedge Mix B of the revised landscaping scheme (plan W1810/1/Rev.C.), 40% of the remaining planting should be locally native species listed in the Natural History Museum's Postcode Plants Database.**
 - (iii) That where possible the driveway and parking surfaces of the existing house and new houses will have permeable surfaces.**
- (2) That officers from the local planning authority be commended for using the Natural History Museum's Postcode Plants Database, that it be made available to Panel members and the Strategic Director, Regeneration be requested to promote its use.**

ACTION: *Strategic Director, Regeneration*

23. **GREENHEAD GRAMMAR SCHOOL, GREEN HEAD ROAD, KEIGHLEY**

Keighley Central

Reserved Matters application for a new two school campus for special educational needs children and mainstream secondary children with associated access, parking and sports facilities on the existing site of Greenhead High School and neighbouring playing fields, Green Head, Utley, Keighley – 08/01592/REM.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that the Keighley Town Council had recommended approval of the application but had expressed concerns regarding increased traffic and flooding issues. Fourteen representations had been received in respect of the application. The summary of representations received were as outlined in Document "C".

The reasons for approving reserved matters were as outlined in Document "C">

Members made the following comments:

- Would there be a time limit on the parking at the school? otherwise it would become a staff car park.
- Some of the colours that were to be used were not acceptable.
- There were flooding issues as well as the volume of traffic.
- Would any lighting be installed to enable children to walk to the school.
- Concern was expressed in relation to the materials that were to be used.
- There should be a cycle path linked to the school.
- It was necessary to see further details in relation to colour samples, drainage and ventilation plans.
- It would be difficult to maintain the colouring at the school over a ten year period.
- here should only be a limited number of colours used.
- In relation to air movement there should be more emphasis on fresh air planning and less emphasis on air conditioning.
- Was it possible to use the grey water for the sprinkler system?

An objector was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- She was speaking on behalf of residents of Skipton Road.
- There was a danger of flooding and Yorkshire Water were originally against the application.
- The culvert at Skipton Road would not be capable of taking extra water.
- Climate change would have an important effect on the development.
- Yorkshire Water's recommendations were not taken into account.
- The strip of woodland opposite Skipton Road which were protected had not been mentioned. The trees were a protective barrier and acted as a buffer.
- The trees needed to be protected.
- The Green Head Road stone walls formed part of the character of the area.
- An officer of the Council had approved the variation of the stone.
- Any development should be tasteful and smart while the proposed development had the appearance of an open prison.
- The landscaping proposals were not adequate.
- The safety of residents of Skipton Road would be affected as they tried to gain access to Green Head Road.

The applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- The planning officers had done a good job in relation to this application.
- Topography wise, it was a difficult site to build on and the building had been positioned where it was proposed because of the requirements of the site.
- In relation to flooding it would be necessary to ensure that the top end was drained properly.
- The perimeter fencing would meet the designing out crime condition.
- The insulation level on the building was high.
- The roofing was at an adequate level.
- All the issues in respect of highway safety had been dealt with.
- The multi-sports games area would be away from the conservation area and would comply with Sport England requirements.
- The materials were a big issue and the different colours to be used were intended to stimulate the students.
- A woodland management plan would be developed and written by the local planning authority.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to Members and objectors' comments and made the following points:

- It could be conditioned to have a travel plan before staff were appointed.
- There would be open access to Green Head School.
- The colouring to be used would give the building a brighter appearance.
- In respect of flooding it had been agreed between drainage experts that the rate that water was drained would be reduced.
- It would be necessary to have a lighting scheme.
- A traffic assessment had been carried out and it had shown that the scheme would improve the situation as there would be more car parking spaces available with mini-buses dropping off persons at Beechcliffe School.
- Highways officers were happy with the traffic and parking assessments of the site.
- The planners were not drainage experts and the local planning authority had consulted with Yorkshire Water who had said that the drainage was suitable.
- The police had stated that they do not want new vegetation near the fence because people might climb the vegetation and get over the fence.
- There was a safe access to Green Head Road, by a footpath there.
- It was confirmed that samples of the colouring to be used had been requested from the applicant.
- There was a cycle way link from Cliffe Castle.
- Grey water re-use was a financial issue.

Resolved –

That consideration of the application be deferred until the next meeting of the Panel to enable the applicant to provide further details in relation to colour samples, drainage and ventilation plans.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

24. 13 GRAFTON ROAD, KEIGHLEY**Keighley West**

Full planning application for construction of detached dwelling at 13 Grafton Road, Keighley – 08/02499/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that a letter of support from a Councillor had been received which made the following points:

- The application had addressed the objections made at the initial stage of the application.
- The plans had been substantially amended in line with requests of local planning officers and were also supported by a Parish Councillor.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- There would be fencing around the dwelling.
- There had been modification to previous drawings.
- He requested the Panel to approve the application and recommended that a site visit takes place before a decision was made.

The reasons for refusal of the application outlined by the Strategic Director, Regeneration was outlined in Document "D".

Members made the following comments:

- Should the fence be down to an acceptable height?
- The proposed development would by reason of its scale, massing, form, height and siting, represent an unwelcome and strident feature.
- It was a shoe-horned development not in keeping with the surrounding properties or in character with surrounding properties.
- The proposed development would by reason of its scale, massing, form, height and siting forward of the established building line on Broomhill Way be an unwelcome and strident feature.
- It was visually incongruous with the existing buildings on Broomhill Way.
- The proposed development fails to provide sufficient and suitable provision within the site for the accommodation of motor vehicles.
- The proposal was unacceptable as the proposed boundary treatment would not adequately secure the proposed dwelling to private amenity area.
- Enforcement officers from the local planning authority should be requested to ensure that the fencing around 13 Grafton Road, Keighley was reduced by one metre in height.

An objector was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- A petition had been organised against the development with 41 signatures from persons from the area in question.
- There was no purpose to the development except for financial gain.
- The area was used as a short cut.
- Grafton Road was regularly double parked due to persons going to school and the church.
- It was a children's play area which they would not be able to use if the development went ahead.

- It was an unsightly structure.
- There were parking problems.

A letter had been received outlining the following points:

- It was a question of safety of children who played in the area.
- There was a blind spot on the road which was made worse by the fencing.
- The view was obstructed.
- It was detrimental to the privacy of residents at Grafton Road.

Another objector was present and made the following points:

- There were two bedroom houses at Grafton Road occupied by retired persons who had settled there for a quiet life.
- The proposed development was only for profiteering.
- Grafton Road and the area around it was usually gridlocked in the morning and in the evenings and it was an accident waiting to happen due to speed bumps on neighbouring roads and not on Grafton Road. One girl had already been knocked down by a vehicle.
- The applicant had asked people to move from his parking space.
- The main worry was for the safety of children, and in particular children on bicycles and scooters near the proposed development.
- The fencing was too high.
- There was no space to put a property on the site.
- It was not right to get rid of the green areas where children play.

Resolved –

(1) That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposed development would, by reason of its scale, massing, form, height and siting, represent an unwelcome and strident feature, visually incongruous with existing development patterns in the vicinity which are characterised by open space at the junctions of roads and standardisation and uniformity of building type, and would therefore be harmful to the visual amenity and character of the street scene. For this reason the proposal is unacceptable when measured against Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**
- (ii) The proposed development would, by reason of its scale, massing, form, height and siting forward of the established building line on Broomhill Way, represent an unwelcome and strident feature, visually incongruous with the existing buildings on Broomhill Way, and therefore harmful to the visual amenity and character of the street scene. For this reason the proposal is unacceptable when measured against Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**
- (iii) The proposed development fails to provide sufficient and suitable provision within the site for the accommodation of motor vehicles as recommended within the Supplementary Planning Guidance contained within the Council's approved Car and Cycle Provision Guidelines. In particular the depth of the parking spaces is substandard. As such the proposed development would result in greater on-street car parking to the detriment**

of the safe and free flow of traffic on the highway. For this reason the proposed development is unacceptable when measured against Policies TM12, TM2, D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and the Council's supplementary Planning Policy on House Extensions.

- (iv) The proposal is unacceptable, as the local planning authority does not consider that the proposed boundary treatment would adequately secure the proposed dwellings private amenity area and the development would therefore not be in accordance with Policy D4 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.
- (2) That enforcement officers from the local planning authority be requested to ensure that the fencing around 13 Grafton Road, Keighley is reduced by one metre in height.

ACTION: *Strategic Director, Regeneration*

25. KENSINGTON STREET, KEIGHLEY

Keighley Central

A change of use application to convert an existing light industrial unit to a community resource centre at Kensington Street, Keighley – 07/09810/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that Keighley Town Council had recommended refusal of the application and had stated that if the industrial unit was to be converted for education purposes there needed to be careful consideration that there were sufficient toilets for boys and girls and all the necessary requirements. There was no space for children to play and exercise. No representations had been received in respect of the application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed change of use from B2 light industrial to D1 community centre would result in the introduction of a community use in a predominantly industrial area resulting in potential conflicts and pedestrian safety issues having regard to the nature of Kensington Street as a through route, service road for commercial properties and with on-street parking. Additionally the proposal failed to provide sufficient and suitable provision within the site for the accommodation of motor vehicles as recommended within the Supplementary Planning Guidance contained within the Council's approved Car and Cycle Provision Guidelines. As such the proposed development would result in greater on-street car parking to the detriment of the safe and free flow of traffic on the highway. For these reasons the proposed development was unacceptable when measured against Policies UR3, TM19A and TM2 of the Council's Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended refusal of planning permission.

Members made the following comments:

- What sort of community centre would it be?
- It did not look like it would be possible to use the third car parking space.

A letter from the applicant had been received outlining the following points:

- There had been delays in reaching a decision in respect of this application.

- The premises would be used by people within walking distance of the property.
- There were chronic social problems in the area for which the centre would help to alleviate.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to Members' comments and made the following points:

- The application was from a representative of an organisation called the Bangladesh Community Association.
- In respect of traffic there would be danger for children and anyone using the premises.
- The centre was a good idea but it was not in the right place.
- No response had been received to a suggestion made to the applicant asking why the association could not use other community based premises in the area.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

The proposed change of use from B2 light industrial to D1 community centre would result in the introduction of a community use in a predominantly industrial area resulting in potential conflicts and pedestrian safety issues having regard to the nature of Kensington Street as a through route, service road for commercial properties and with on street parking. Additionally the proposal fails to provide sufficient and suitable provision within the site for the accommodation of motor vehicles as recommended within the Supplementary Planning Guidance contained within the Council's approved Car and Cycle Provision Guidelines. As such the proposed development would result in greater on-street car parking to the detriment of the safe and free flow of traffic on the highway. For these reasons the proposed development is unacceptable when measured against Policies UR3, TM19A and TM2 of the Council's Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

Chair

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Panel.

minutes\plk10july

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER