

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 13 November 2008 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 1005
Adjourned 1045
Reconvened 1055
Adjourned 1145
Reconvened 1155
Concluded 1335

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR
Greaves	Shabir Hussain
Hill	Lee
Servant	Rowen

Apologies: Councillor Ellis

Ward Councillors Present: Clamp and Mallinson

Councillor Greaves in the Chair

69. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair reported that Councillor Ellis was absent from the meeting as his son had been taken seriously ill.

The Chair welcomed Councillor Shabir Hussain to his first meeting of the Panel.

Resolved –

That the sympathies of the Panel be forwarded to Councillor Ellis.



2006-2007
Improving Rural Services
Empowering Communities



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Suzan Hemingway, Assistant Director Corporate Services (City Solicitor)



BRADFORD
METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COUNCIL

70. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillors Hill and Lee disclosed a personal interest in Minute 78 for matters relating to Land at Oakbank School, Oakworth, but as the interest was not prejudicial they took full part in the discussion and voting on this item.

ACTION: *Assistant Director, Corporate Services (City Solicitor)*

71. MINUTES

Resolved -

That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2008 be signed as a correct record.

72. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

73. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.

74. DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEALS DISMISSED

(i) LAND AT WHITE CRAG, LIGHT BANK LANE, SILSDEN Craven

Change of use of land to motor-cycle trials use four days per year – 07/4172/FUL.

(ii) 12 FLAPPIT SPRINGS, HAWORTH ROAD, CULLINGWORTH Bingley Rural

Construction of rear two storey extension – 07/08441/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration indicated that this item would also be reported to the Area Planning Panel (Shipley).

(iii) WIRE FIELDS, INGROW LANE, KEIGHLEY Keighley West

Construction of 44 dwellings and 18 flats – 07/10439/FUL.

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

NO ACTION

75. LAND AT LINNBURN MEWS, QUEENS ROAD, ILKLEY

Ilkley

Consideration of an objection to Tree Preservation Order - 08/00053/IG, Section 201 Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Land at Linnburn Mews, Queens Road, Ilkley.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that a Tree Preservation Order was made on 3 July 2008 as a result of a Notice of Intent within the Conservation Area submitted on 27 May 2008 to prune a Beech tree and remove two Cypress trees. Due to the lack of detailed information on the extent of the pruning it was considered that this work would be likely to be detrimental to the health and amenity value of the tree and no indication of replacement planting was provided in relation to the Cypress trees which were of significant amenity value within the Ilkley Conservation Area. For these reasons the Tree Preservation Order was made.

The trees were of significant visual amenity value visible from Queens Road and the surrounding area. The Council cannot refuse a Notice of Intent and must either allow the works or make a TPO.

It was considered expedient to confirm the Order as if not confirmed the trees could be destroyed in terms of their visual amenity value due to the unspecified nature of the works within the notice on the Beech and removal of the two Cypress trees and clearly this would be detrimental to the health of the trees.

There had been one letter received making general comment and one objection to the Order as outlined in Document "N".

Members made the following comments:

- The owner of the land at Linnburn Mews, Queens Road, Ilkley should be asked to liaise with the local planning authority if he/she wants to carry out any work on the tree in question.

Resolved –

That the objection be overruled and Tree Preservation Order 08/00053/IG be confirmed without modification and that the owner of the Land at Linnburn Mews, Queens Road, Ilkley be asked to liaise with the local planning authority if he/she wants to carry out any work on the tree in question.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

76. LAND AT 15 KINGS ROAD, ILKLEY

Ilkley

Consideration of two objections to Tree Preservation Order – 08/00055/I, Section 201 Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Land at 15 Kings Road, Ilkley.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that a Tree Preservation Order was made on 3 July 2008 as a result of a Notice of Intent within the Ilkley Conservation Area submitted on 20 May 2008 to heavily prune a variegated Sycamore, Horse Chestnut and

removal of a Cypress. Despite previous bad pruning to the Sycamore and Chestnut all three trees were in a significant visual position in relation to Kings Road and South Parade with considerable amenity value. There were vagaries in relation to the accuracy of an old Tree Preservation Order on the Cypress (TPO0136:1971). For these reasons a Tree Preservation Order was made on all three trees.

The trees were of a significant visual amenity value visible from Kings Road and South Parade area. The Council cannot refuse a Notice of Intent and must either allow the works or make a TPO.

It was considered expedient to confirm the Order as if not confirmed the trees could be destroyed in terms of their visual amenity value due to the excessive nature of the works within the Notice on the Sycamore and Chestnut together with the removal of the Cypress and clearly this would be detrimental to the health of the trees.

Consent had since been granted and undertaken for minor works to the Sycamore and Chestnut. Consent to remove the Cypress had been denied and was currently at appeal. There was currently an application for a single storey extension to the property at number 15 (08/05948/FUL) received on 22 September 2008. This was likely to impact on the Cypress. There had been two objections to the Order on the grounds as outlined in Document "N".

A late representation had been received objecting to the Tree Preservation Order on the following grounds:

- The Council had protected trees not worthy of protection.
- The reasons for making the Order were not fully explained or justified.
- The Order contains a significant error and was therefore invalid.

The Council's legal representative reported that the late objection had not been submitted within the required statutory period and that the legal reasons for making the Tree Preservation Order were sound.

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

- The trees were an inconvenience.
- The tree was not worthy of protection.
- The Council had not made adequate justification for issuing a Tree Preservation Order.
- The reason why the Council had issued the Order was that the trees had significant visibility and amenity value but this was not the case.
- The trees had been pruned and they should stay.
- The Cypress tree which is 25 metres in height does not have any significant value to the objector or his neighbour.
- The trees T1 and T2 were in a poor structural condition and there were risks such as branch failure and there was evidence that the trees would pose harm to people.
- It was a large overbearing tree.
- The trees were affecting the objector's wife who was convalescing at the moment.
- People were more important than trees.

Members made the following comments:

- The tree identified as T3 should be excluded from the Order as it does not have any

amenity value.

- Was the application for a single storey extension anything to do with the decision process?
- It was necessary to find out if tree T3 was protected.
- If an application to remove T3 was appealed on the original Order, then the Panel's decision should be reported to the Planning Inspectorate.

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

- The trees were worthy of protection.
- The application for a single storey extension was nothing to do with the decision process as it was already too close to the relevant building.
- If there was any doubt about whether T3 was protected then another order could be made.

The Council's legal representative advised that the Order was valid as it had been set out substantially in the form required and that there was no need to set it out totally as required. The applicant was able to make an appeal to the courts.

Resolved –

- (1) That the objections be overruled and Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 08/00055/I be confirmed with the following modification:**
 - (i) That the tree identified as T3 be excluded from the Order as it is the view of the Panel that it does not have any amenity value.**
- (2) That if an application to remove T3 is appealed on the original Order then the Panel's decision should be reported to the Planning Inspectorate.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

77. KEIGHLEY LABORATORIES, CROFT HOUSE, KEIGHLEY Keighley Central

This application seeks full planning permission for the construction of a replacement industrial building at Keighley Laboratories Ltd, Croft House, Keighley – 08/03289/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 approval of the application. A petition of objection containing a total of 96 names had been received. A summary of representations received were as outlined in Document "N".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that whilst the proposed building was necessarily of a greater scale than the building it would replace, it was considered that on balance the proposed low key use, the changes to vehicular access, the benefits to this successful local business and the overall visual improvement arising from the removal of the dilapidated existing building made the proposals attractive. In the circumstances, whilst the concerns of neighbouring residents had been noted, and had been addressed to a degree by amendments to the proposals, it was considered that the development would be acceptable in terms of local amenity and the appearance of the wider street scene. Accordingly the proposals were considered to be in accordance with Policies UDP3, UR3

and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. The Strategic Director, Regeneration therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

Members made the following comments:

- The entrance to South Street elevation should only be used for ancillary purposes and should not be used as the main entrance, it should not remain open when not in use for these purposes.
- The footway on Catherine Street should be reinstated with a dropped kerb being brought up to a full kerb.
- A letter had been received which had not been signed by anybody. How much weight could be put on this letter?
- If the door was only opened a few times a year does it need to be there at all?
- The business was a well established and expanding business in Keighley.
- The application should be approved.

A letter has been received in respect of the application and the main points of the letter were summarised as outlined below:

- Now was an appropriate time to consider traffic lights for the crossing to make residents lives safer.
- Whilst we are not in agreement with the new plans we do feel that they are better than provisional plans and that if all the conditions were met particularly with regard to adequate soundproofing on the crossing it would be more acceptable.

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

- He supported officer comments and indicated that the entrance at South Street elevation would only be used a few times a year to get in large equipment and components.
- Keighley Laboratories had been at the location since 1920 and was a responsible employer, the company would address quickly any environmental issues.
- This development was necessary to make the business more efficient.
- New processes were carried out at the business and machines were a lot quieter than in the past.
- Investment on the site was enormous and it was a major investment benefit which added job security to 60 families in Keighley.
- There were no other plans to do anything else on the site.

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

- Concerning the traffic conditions on South Street there would be a zebra crossing on the main road.
- The issue of smell was being investigated and the drainage engineer would have another look.
- The planned development would make the business operation more efficient and cost effective. The South Street elevation would only be used a few times a year.
- The building has an existing use which was no different than what was proposed in the application.

Resolved –

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

- (i) That the entrance to the South Street elevation shall only be used for ancillary purposes and shall not be used as the main entrance and shall not remain open when not in use for these purposes**
- (ii) That the footway on Catherine Street be reinstated with the dropped kerb being brought up to a full kerb.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

78. LAND AT OAKBANK SCHOOL, OAKWORTH

Keighley West

Full planning application for the construction of a concrete skatepark, with associated footways and internal access works, Land at Oakbank School, Oakworth Road, Keighley – 08/04739/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that Keighley Town Council had expressed support for the proposal and 42 standardised letters of objection bearing addresses and signatures and a petition of objection containing 42 signatures had been received. A summary of representations received were as outlined in Document "N".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that subject to adequate safeguards that can be dealt with by conditions the development was considered acceptable in principle and was considered to accord with land use planning policy since it comprises a sport and recreation facility within an established school curtilage.

The existence of CCTV coverage and appropriate signage to remind users that images of activity on and around the site were recorded, should discourage anti-social behaviour and satisfactorily address concerns expressed by nearest neighbours regarding misuse of the site. The impact of the skatepark would, in effect, extend the hours that children and young people were active on the school grounds. There would be some noise generation but given the distances to nearest neighbouring dwellings and the intervening boundary wall and trees, it was not considered that disturbance would be a significant issue.

Skateboards and skates were already well used by children and young people and that at present these were generally used on pavements, on roads and in public parks in the area. This had the potential to generate nuisance and, clearly, a risk to highway and pedestrian safety. The provision of a facility designed for the purpose would address these existing issues of local amenity and highway safety and from a local amenity perspective the proposals were on balance attractive.

It was considered that the skatepark construction would be sited with sufficient separation from the trees on the site frontage. It was suggested that protective fencing be provided so that no damage occurs whilst the facility was being constructed. For these reasons the development would be in general accordance with Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

The proposals were within an existing school curtilage and adjacent to a fairly large car park. It was anticipated that most young people using the facility would not be car drivers. As limited traffic would be generated by the skatepark there, a separate vehicular access to it was not necessary and in the circumstances the development would have no implications for highway safety or the free flow of traffic. The proposal therefore accords with Policies TM2 and TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. The Strategic Director, Regeneration therefore recommended approval of the application, subject to conditions.

Members made the following comments:

- No shelter or other ancillary building should be erected on the site without the permission of the local planning authority.
- A scheme in respect of the pedestrian access should be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- It was necessary to discover the status of the woodland abutting the site and if practical to re-instate the fence separating the application site from the woodland.
- In the past the entrance had been locked due to anti-social behaviour and the police did not want the public there.

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

- The siting of the development was ideal as the school had a good sports reputation.
- As it was a school site it could be monitored.
- Trees would prevent noise getting through.
- It was good for Keighley and the Keighley Town and Country Planning Committee had recommended approval of the application.

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

- He had done research and had discovered that skateboarding was in decline in the area.
- The site for a skatepark development does not have to be close to the school.
- The nature reserve will be affected by the development.
- The skatepark will be used by gangs of youths 30 to 40 strong who already go around Keighley.
- On Ingrow Lane pupils walk four to five abreast causing obstruction and tend to have no regard to traffic.
- It will be too close to houses at Ingrow Lane.

A representative of SportKeighley was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- A number of different persons were on the Project Steering Group for the development and the genesis of this project was a long way back and there was a need to improve the availability of diversionary activities for young persons in the Keighley area.
- The scheme for Keighley was an integrated package.
- Young persons had been asked where they would like the skatepark to be located.
- Bradford has the opportunity to have three skatepark sites available with one in Keighley and two in other areas to be funded through lottery funding.
- The development was not called the Oakbank Skateboard Park but the Oakbank

Urban Sports Facility and had been designed also for cycling and other activities.

- The development was in agreement with planning policy.
- It would help to have a new area of sport in Keighley.
- He understood objectors' fears and concerns and had offered to discuss the issue with the Town Council and it had been agreed to site the skatepark on the location as proposed in the application.

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

- It would be possible to install a short section of fencing against the side of the facility to contain it and ensure an obvious separation of the application site from the woodland.
- It was a large size school and can operate outside school hours.
- The nature reserve copes with the goings on of school children outside the school gates, this was a public domain and any issues of anti-social behaviour would be a matter for the police.
- A condition could be installed to illuminate this facility.

Resolved –

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

- (i) That no shelter or other ancillary building be erected on the site without the permission of the local planning authority**
- (ii) That a scheme in respect of the pedestrian access be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority**
- (iii) That it be delegated to the Strategic Director, Regeneration to discover the status of the woodland abutting the site and if practical to reinstate the fence separating the application site from the woodland.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

79. 5 CLOUGH AVENUE, STEETON, KEIGHLEY

Craven

A retrospective planning application for a rear part single part two storey extension, alterations to the existing garage and a porch to the front elevation and hardstanding to the front at 5 Clough Avenue, Steeton, Keighley – 08/05577/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council had concerns about how this application and the previous application for this site had been handled. The Parish Council had indicated it would, reluctantly, support the planner's decision as they had no suitable course of action. Representations would be made to Senior Planning Officers as the Town Council felt a dangerous precedent was being set in that enforcement action was not taken against applicants who go ahead and build structures for which they do not have planning permission. Three letters were received in objection to the proposals and one letter was received in support of the extension. A

summary of representations received were as outlined in Document "O".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the development was not considered to adversely affect the character of the host dwelling or the character of the streetscene. It was considered that the proposal would not have any significant adverse effects upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring residents and was acceptable in terms of highway safety. As such the proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policies UR3, D1 and TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and the Council's revised House Extensions Policy Document. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

Members made the following comments:

- Was the garage there before?
- There were two additional letters and the occupier of the adjoining property had said that "work on the house was approved by himself".
- The guttering of the applicant's property would overhang the neighbour's property at No. 3 Clough Avenue.
- Nothing illegal had happened.
- They expressed concern in respect of the planning section of the Council's website as there had been complaints about the website.
- There was less obstruction to the objectors property and it was less of an imposition.
- If the applicants were asked to knock down the extension they could build it again as a result of the 2006 application which was more intrusive.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting. He objected to the application and made the following points:

- The objector's husband had lived at 3 Clough Avenue for 33 years and the development had distressed her and her family.
- Only three residents had been informed in respect of the application.
- Building works had been carried out which were not in accordance with the plans.
- He had contacted the local planning authority but it had taken a while for enforcement officers to come and look at the development.
- The Council's planning website was not good enough.
- A decision had been made on 29 April 2008 and no other information had been received in respect of enforcement.
- There had been a lack of communication between the applicant, the architects, neighbours and Building Control.
- How often did Building Control visit the site and consider issues such as foul water drainage.
- The balcony window which was fitted and modified provided no privacy for the objector in her kitchen and should be changed to frosted/pattern glass.
- The original garage had been demolished and a new bigger garage had been built.
- There were no additional gullies to remove surface water.
- There was the issue of party walls and a possible civil dispute.
- He recommended that the garage should be demolished.
- The development was not in keeping with the surrounding area and the character of the area could be lost.
- The development was an eyesore.
- The porch should be demolished and should be in line with the original design of the street.
- The hardstanding was not in keeping with the street design.

- There was concern that water would gather and run off from the garage and also from the hardstanding.
- It was important to ensure that all measures dealing with surface/foul water had been approved and checked.
- There would be a lack of light in the objector's kitchen.

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

- She lived at No. 3 Clough Avenue and would have to look onto the extension.
- She was not against people building extensions.
- In 2006 the Parish Council had turned this application down unanimously as it was not in keeping with surrounding properties.
- Some people who had objected now supported the application.
- The application submitted in 2006 was not adhered to and building work had begun in March 2008 without planning permission.
- The garage was not built in a straight line but was built around up to the boundary and onto a slope.
- She was disabled and had to live in her dining room for four months.
- The applicant's guttering overhangs her garden shed.
- The end of the garage was not in line with the building extension.
- We have lost some good friends in respect of this matter and it was really hurtful.
- We welcomed the applicant into this area and have lived here for 33 years.
- From my kitchen sink I cannot see the sky and I have a right to light.

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

- It was a two storey extension which had received approval.
- The original approved application included a porch and the porch would be smaller than had been originally intended.
- The garage had been changed and would have a pitched roof. There were several other garages on the street that had pitched roofs and this would be better both aesthetically and for maintenance purposes.
- In respect of the issue of right to light there would be far less light if the two full storey extension had been built as originally approved.
- The first floor extension was acceptable and an officer had approved it in the past.

A supporter of the applicant was at the meeting and made the following points:

- He lived next door to the applicant and after seven months of work they had made a beautiful house.
- The applicants were the nicest people he had met in his life.

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

- The porch was a modest feature.
- A flat roofed garage had been on the site previously
- The new garage would change the neighbours view but not significantly as there would be less build.
- The additional height of the pitched roof would not have much more impact than the flat roof garage.
- There had been a petition with 14 signatories saying that the porch was an eyesore

and that there should be a full investigation of all aspects of this retrospective planning application.

- The planning section had carried out an investigation and concluded that there would be less build on the site and that it would not have a significant effect on neighbours.
- It was not expedient to stop the building work.
- The building did accord with the Council's House Extensions Policy.
- None of the extension work in the garage could have been done as permitted development but the hardstanding could have been done. This was a concern to residents.
- He recommended that retrospective planning permission be granted.
- The issue of the shed was a private legal matter.
- The extension was on the north side of No. 3 Clough Avenue.
- The Parish Council did refuse the application in 2006 but it was now under the consideration of the local planning authority.
- A small amendment has been made and the applicant had asked if this could be dealt with as a modification and they were informed that they would need to make a planning application.
- There was no right to light in planning law.
- Letters had been sent to five neighbours of the applicant, which met the local planning authority's code of practice of notifying those that were affected by the development.
- Not all enforcement details were put on the planning website.
- The extension had not yet been signed off by building regulations officers. There was a need to look at the electric and ventilation systems for certain rooms of the extension.
- He was not aware of water gathering on the hardstanding.
- The frosted glass to the landing window was not a requirement as it was not a habitable room.
- There would be less obstruction to the objectors view as the development was further back than as originally proposed.

Resolved –

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

- (i) **That the Strategic Director, Regeneration be delegated to secure an undertaking from the applicant by means of a Section 106 obligation to ensure the previous planning permission (reference 06/02965/FUL) granted on the 20 June 2006 is of no further effect.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

80. "HIGHCLIFFE", CLIFF STREET, HAWORTH

Worth Valley

Full planning application for demolition of existing bungalow and construction of seven town houses on land at "Highcliffe", Cliff Street, Haworth – 08/04639/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that Haworth Parish Council had expressed concern as to the density of the development. The site was very steep and there was

concern about the off-street parking. The dormer windows were not considered to be in the vernacular. He reported that 26 objections, mostly from nearby residents had been received. A Ward Councillor had also objected and had requested determination of the application by the Area Planning Panel. A summary of representations received were as outlined in Document "O".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed development would provide a density of dwellings appropriate to the character of the surrounding area and the form, scale, design and materials of the proposed development were considered compatible with the local pattern of development in the Haworth Brow area. Adequate separation was maintained between the new housing and existing houses and subject to compliance with the amended drawings and subject to the attached conditions, the development was not considered to adversely affect the living conditions of occupants of adjoining or surrounding houses. Parking was adequate and the development would have no adverse effects on road safety. The development was considered to be in accordance with Policies UR3, D1, TM12, TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) and guidance set out in PPS3 on "Housing". He therefore recommended that subject to conditions the application be approved.

Members made the following comments:

- The application was in keeping with the area.
- It was a beautiful design.
- The Panel was happy with the application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that he was happy with the parking that would be provided.

Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

81. **FAIRFAX COPPY FARM, MOSS CARR ROAD,
LONG LEE, KEIGHLEY**

Keighley East

Full planning application for the construction of a first floor extension to the rear of Fairfax Coppy Farm, Moss Carr Road – 08/05503/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that Keighley Town Council had objected as the proposal was out of keeping with the original dwelling and the Town Council had recommended refusal of the application. No representations had been received and the Ward Councillor had requested determination of the application by the Panel but had not expressed support or opposition to the proposal.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration recommended that the application should be refused for the following reasons:

- The site was located within the Green Belt as defined in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) and was subject to the green belt policies of the RUDP

and Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 “Green Belts”. The proposed extension was considered to be a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling, contrary to the character of that original dwelling and detracting from the openness of the Green Belt. The extension was therefore unacceptable as it would be contrary to Policies GB1 and GB5 of the RUDP. The applicant had not demonstrated any very special circumstances to justify a departure from the normal presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

- The proposed extension would harm the visual amenity of the green belt in that it was not in keeping with the original property and would detract from the originally constructed dwelling at Fairfax Coppy Farm contrary to Policies UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

Members made the following comments:

- The Town Council had recommended refusal of the application as the proposal was out of keeping with the original dwelling.
- Were people able to build conservatories in the green belt?
- The application should be refused as the applicant had not demonstrated any evidence of special circumstances at present.
- The area was in the green belt.

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

- She had visited the site and had gone to the cottage..
- The applicant had made an attractive house.
- There were family reasons for the construction of the extension as the applicant was looking after the father of his wife/partner.
- The development would not alter the streetscene.
- There was no property behind the development, it was not a habitable building.
- She recommended a site visit if the view was to refuse the application.

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

- The applicants house was adjoining the green belt but was not actually in the green belt.
- Work could be carried out under permitted development rights.
- There were family reasons for carrying out the extension.
- The Council had already approved the extension.
- The development would not be harmful to the green belt.
- This site relates to adjoining properties.

Resolved –

- (1) That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report and because the application does not demonstrate any evidence of special circumstances at present.**
- (2) If the applicant is to submit any future application then he/she should submit evidence of any special circumstances.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

Note: Following legal advice received from the Assistant Director Corporate Services (City Solicitor) after the meeting the above decision will be referred to the Regulatory and Appeals Committee for consideration to comply with Article 8.4.3 of the Constitution.

82. LAND ADJACENT TO 13 GRAFTON ROAD, KEIGHLEY Keighley West

Full planning application for the construction of one detached dwelling on land adjacent to 13 Grafton Road, Keighley – 08/05146/FUL.

Note: This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

NO ACTION

Chair

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

minutes\plk13nov

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