

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

www.bradford.gov.uk

(mins.dot)

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley) held on Monday 3 August 2009 in the Kings Hall, Station Road, Ilkley

Commenced 1003
 Adjourned 1120
 Reconvened 1130
 Site Visits 1415 – 1515
 Adjourned 1610
 Reconvened 1615
 Concluded 1630

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR
Greaves	Shabir Hussain
Hill	Lee
Ellis	

Apologies: Councillor Rowen

Ward Councillors: Councillors Hawkesworth and B M Smith

Councillor Greaves in the Chair

20. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Greaves disclosed a personal interest in Minutes 24 and 25 for matters relating to Tesco Store, Springs Lane, Ilkley and Land at Railway Road and Mayfield Road, Ilkley, as he was casually acquainted with some of the persons who had come to speak on these items, but as the interest was not prejudicial he took full part in the discussion and voting on these items.

Councillors Greaves, Hill, Ellis, Shabir Hussain and Lee disclosed a personal interest in Minute 26 for matters relating to 14 Yewbank Terrace, Ilkley as they knew the Councillor who had drawn up the plans, but as the interest was not prejudicial they took full part in the discussion and voting on this item.



2006-2007
 Improving Rural Services
 Empowering Communities



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Suzan Hemingway, Assistant Director Corporate Services (City Solicitor)



BRADFORD
 METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Councillors Greaves, Hill, Ellis, Shabir Hussain and Lee disclosed a personal interest in Minute 27 for matters relating to 2 Coles Way, Riddlesden, Keighley as they knew the Councillor who had submitted the application, 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)

21. MINUTES

Resolved -

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2009 be signed as a correct record.

22. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

23. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.

DECISION FOLLOWING SITE VISIT

24. TESCO STORE, SPRINGS LANE, ILKLEY

Ilkley

An outline planning application with all matters reserved for a mixed use development to provide 5 single storey B1/B8 business units (929 sqm), office floor space (1858 sqm) and a residential care home (60 bedroom with associated car parking and landscaping works at Tesco Store, Springs Lane, Ilkley - 09/00871/OUT).

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. Eighteen letters of representation had been received objecting to the application. The summary of representations received was as outlined in Document "E".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration outlined the following amendments to Document "E":

- Page 5 - the word "use" should replace the word "sure" in the last sentence of the paragraph in relation to Transport Assessment (TA).
- Page 5 – the word "sign" should be used to replace the word "sand" in the paragraph in relation to site access road.
- Page 8 – the word "use" should replace the word "sure" in paragraph 7 in relation to highway/pedestrian safety.
- Page 10 – paragraph 20 – the last sentence should read as follows "there is a requirement for the applicants to upgrade public transport infrastructure and to provide funding provision for a new curve at the nearest bus stop and to fund traffic

lights at the lane, at a cost of £3,000".

- Page 13 - in respect of the heads of terms agreement the second sentence should read "The funding of Traffic Regulation Orders - £5,000".
- Page 13 - the last sentence should read "Provision of raised kerb at the bus stop".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the development of the site with a mixed use employment generating scheme was considered an acceptable reuse of a visually unattractive site that gave the opportunity to provide a sustainable pattern of commercial development within the existing urban fabric of Ilkley. The effect of the proposal on the adjacent conservation area, the surrounding locality and the adjacent neighbouring properties had been assessed and it was acceptable with the scheme, in principle, having the potential at detailed design stage to provide a positive enhancement of the locality. In principle a suitable access to the site could be provided as well as sufficient parking for the proposed uses. As such, the proposal allowed for the redevelopment of a brownfield site in a sustainable location by the delivery of a mixed use scheme. Overall, it was considered that the provision of a mixed use scheme in the manner proposed was in conformity with the principles outlined within national planning policy and the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to a Section 106 legal agreement and the conditions outlined in Document "E".

Members made the following comments:

- Would the application benefit the local community?
- There would be a loss of local shops.
- It would be necessary to deal with any noise nuisance that would affect the care home.
- Would there be a bus stop near the site?
- If the application was approved could another supermarket take over the building?
- As a Planning Panel do we have a duty to consider this outline planning application.
- There were no details available in the application in respect of access to Spring Road and it was unusual that these details were not available.
- Has anything been done about the proposed traffic assessment?
- If there was less traffic then any access would be okay.
- A community car park would be useful.
- Did Tesco consult with the public?
- It was requested that a site visit take place.

A number of objectors spoke at the meeting against approval of the application and they made the following points:

- There were strong reasons to reject the application.
- The proposals entailed under-utilisation of the site.
- The proposals were inadequate.
- There was little, if any, material benefit to the town from the application.
- It would involve yet another care home.
- Many local authorities did not consider care homes as employment uses.
- There was an opportunity to introduce retail activity in the western area of the town.
- If Tesco wished to support the town centre then they would have taken a more holistic approach.
- The application should be refused due to the wholly inadequate information that had been provided.

- There should have been further information provided in respect of urban design, architecture and transport.
- There was a need for integrated transport facilities.
- A valid reason to refuse application was the inadequacy of the urban design solutions proposed and lack of information provided.
- There would be a great loss of industrial and employment land and it would be replaced by housing.
- The best site for housing was the Mayfield site.
- On Skipton Road a group of shops had closed down and this had damaged community interaction.
- To lose a supermarket and to gain homes was not good.
- It would create a residential home ghetto in the area.
- Part of the attraction of Ilkley Town Centre was that people can view the countryside around the town.
- The site should stay as a supermarket.
- Planning permission should be refused.
- This application should be deferred until the next application was heard.

A Ward Councillor recommended that approval of the application would be premature and should be deferred until the local development framework was established in 2012.

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

- He recommended that the application be refused.
- The clear access to the site would be removed.
- Ilkley does not need more care homes or office space.
- There are care home spaces available in Ilkley and new homes were being built in Ben Rhydding.
- The mixture of proposals was wrong.
- No consideration was being given to the heritage of the site, in particular the stone walls with railings.
- The site was adjacent to a conservation area.
- Springs Terrace was already in a conservation area.
- Access to the site was vital and this outline application did not provide any details of it.
- Preserving the present parking situation was important.
- The development would take away the view of the conservation area.
- Very little consultation had taken place on what Ilkley town centre needed.
- The application should be rejected as it was a departure from the unitary development plan.

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

- Tesco was an important local employer which employed 197 persons.
- The existing store was 25 years old and was not able to meet customers' full requirements.
- She welcomed the Strategic Director, Regeneration's recommendation of approval for the application.
- The development would benefit Ilkley Town Centre as it would create additional jobs.
- The application would contribute to the vitality of Ilkley town centre and would

regenerate a brownfield site.

- There would be improvements in respect of open space provision.
- There would be greater economic development potential of the site.
- The application was within the guidelines of Policy PPS1.
- The application was not a departure from the unitary development plan.
- The application was accompanied by a planning and traffic assessment.
- Tesco had not been requested to provide further information in respect of access to the site.
- Discussions had been held with officers in respect of retail units and Tesco had not received any guidance from officers and would be happy to have a retail use in the west end area of the site.
- The development would regenerate a key site in Ilkley.
- There would be a reduction of traffic in the vicinity of the site.
- The application would, if approved, promote the diversification of the local economy in Ilkley.

Another Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and she spoke against the application.

- The application should be refused.
- There would be no added benefit to Ilkley town centre from the proposed development.
- Approval of the application would reduce the retail space in Ilkley town centre. The site was an important site near Ilkley Town Hall, the library, Kings Hall and the Winter Gardens and was also near to the railway station.
- Proper utilisation of the site was essential for the vitality of Ilkley town centre.
- A care home was not an appropriate development in this area of a vibrant and busy town centre.
- She requested that a site visit be undertaken.
- The current Tesco store should be brought up to date for customers.
- A residential care home was not appropriate and goes against Policies UDP6 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to Members, objectors, a Parish Councillor and Ward Councillors' comments and made the following points:

- This development would be in the central shopping area of Ilkley and retail use of the site would be preferable.
- There should not be any loss of parking space.
- Metro had asked for a bus stop by the site.
- The proposed use of the site was an appropriate use of the site.
- It was appropriate to include retail use on the western area of the site.
- Smaller units would increase the retail offer for Ilkley town centre.
- There was lack of information provided by the developers but they had chosen to submit an outline application with all matters reserved.
- The site was not within a conservation area.
- The proposal would create jobs and there would be an economic benefit.
- It was up to market forces to determine whether it was right to put another care home in the area.
- In respect of retail provision the advice given by consultants was that if no other supermarket replaced the one currently on the site then retail provision would be lost and that any under-provision could lead to migration of people out of the Ilkley

- Town Centre in order to obtain their shopping.
- Any reduction of floor space would lead to a reduction of the number of people employed at the development.
- It had not yet been decided where access to the site would be provided.
- There was an existing access to the site as it was already used as a supermarket.
- If Tesco was to move to a new site then under the heads of terms agreement there would be a cessation of retail use at the old store.
- The care home would be three storey's high.
- It was not considered that the mixed use was a departure from the unitary development plan.
- It was understandable that there were concerns about access to the site.

The agent for the applicant confirmed that Tesco had consulted with the public and the exhibition and consultation event had been well attended.

The Council's legal representative made the following points:

- Planning permission for retail use would remain on the site.
- The application should be considered on its merits within policy guidelines.
- The planning panel had a duty to consider this outline planning application as a lot of the matters were reserved.
- If there was a fundamental issue in question then it should be included in the outline application and there could be an argument for suggesting that access details should have been included with the outline application.
- The issue of internal refurbishment of the present Tesco supermarket was not a planning issue.

Following a site visit Members made the following comments:

- It was not a sound application and the site should remain as it was.
- Change of the site would not benefit the local community.
- The proposed care home facility was considered an inappropriate and undesirable use of this Central Shopping Area of Ilkley Town Centre, which failed to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre itself.
- The site should remain only for retail use.
- The proposal was considered unacceptable as there would be a loss of retail capacity within the central shopping area of Ilkley Town Centre.
- The application should be refused as it provided insufficient information to enable its proper consideration by the local planning authority.
- In particular there was inadequate information on access issues.
- There would be undue noise and disturbance to residents of Springs Lane.
- The care home would be too close to the railway station and would fail to provide a quality setting for the development and harm the amenity of future residents.
- Ilkley Town Centre was a beautiful town centre which should be looked after.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed care home facility is considered an inappropriate and undesirable use in this Central Shopping Area of Ilkley Town Centre which fails to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the centre itself. Moreover, it is considered that such a use sandwiched between the existing**

retail/commercial properties and proposed commercial premises and the railway line would fail to provide a quality setting for the development and harm the amenity of future residents, as such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies UDP6, UR3, CT1 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

2. The proposal is considered unacceptable in that there would be a loss of retail capacity within the Central Shopping Area of Ilkley Town Centre. This would compromise the councils strategy of seeking to (i) sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centres, (ii) to focus development, especially retail development, in locations where the proximity of businesses facilitates competition from which all consumers are able to benefit and maximizes the opportunity to use means of transport other than the car, and, (iii) to ensure the availability of a wide range of shops to which people have easy access by a choice of means of transport. As such, it is considered the proposal is contrary to policies UDP6, UR3 and CT1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.
3. The application provides insufficient information to enable its proper consideration by the local planning authority. In particular there is inadequate information on access issues (especially with regard to how the access can be successfully achieved on the site due to the substantial level differences between the site and Springs Lane, and how an access will affect the parking bays outside 2- 42 Springs Lane), as such it is considered that the proposal may be contrary to policies TM2 and TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: *Strategic Director, Regeneration*

DECISION FOLLOWING SITE VISIT

25. LAND AT RAILWAY ROAD AND MAYFIELD ROAD, ILKLEY

Ilkley

Full planning application for the construction of a replacement Class A1 retail store with car parking, landscaping and associated works on Land at Railway Road and Mayfield Road, Ilkley – 09/00857/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 refusal of the application. A substantial number of representations had been received including:

- Objections to the scheme – 2169 letters (which included 964 pro-rotas letters) and three petitions with (5466 signatures).
- Support for the scheme – 20 letters.

The summary of representations received was as outlined in Document "E".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposal was considered unacceptable in that it was located in an out of centre location, outside the central shopping centre of the town centre and outside the identified town centre expansion site. The Council's retail strategy was to sustain and enhance the centres and the proposed development failed to demonstrate that need, appropriateness of scale, the sequential

approach and impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre have been satisfied, as such the proposal was considered to be contrary to Policies UDP6, CR1A and CR4A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and Planning Policy Statement 6.

It was considered that the proposed scheme was unacceptable in that, due to highway congestion and traffic on the highway network in the vicinity of the new store and at the junction of The Grove/Springs Lane/Brook Street, Brook Street/Railway Road and Brook Street/Church Street./A65 Leeds Road, there would be undue noise and disturbance in close proximity to existing residential properties which would be detrimental to the established amenities, as such the proposal was considered to be contrary to Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended refusal of the application.

Members made the following comments:

- There would be a loss of protected trees.
- There was a lack of design information in the application.
- Were all the streets in question residential streets?
- Was it correct to assume that all the houses in question were terraced houses without any alternative parking spaces?
- When would the traffic assessment report be available?
- It was necessary to have a site visit and also to look at any traffic assessment report.
- What was the traffic situation in respect of the streets surrounding Railway Road and Mayfield Road, Ilkley?
- It was noted that the Panel did not have the authority to approve any traffic regulation orders but that this was the remit of the area committee.
- How many commercial vehicles would be delivering to the site?

A number of objectors spoke at the meeting and made the following points:

- The application was not in the public interest.
- The people affected by the development proposal should have a voice and their concerns should be listened to.
- Ilkley and Keighley were facing horrendous mandatory targets for housing.
- There were no targets for retail provision.
- Provision of housing such as affordable housing was being put before normal planning requirements.
- There were about 1,300 people in Ilkley with housing needs. Tesco had said that they could deliver housing provision during a recession and they should put the area to housing use rather than retail use and help to provide affordable housing.
- If the application was approved then the traffic conditions in the area would be horrific.
- A survey had been carried out and 67% of businesses which had responded to the survey were in opposition to the Tesco development.
- The development was 400 metres from the primary shopping area and would be unattractive for users during poor weather.
- The development would not encourage business for Ilkley Town Centre.
- Traffic in the area would increase.
- Any food needs could be accommodated in the town centre.
- There was a key retail argument for objecting to the development and a compelling case to refuse the application.
- The development would be devastating for residents.

- There would be an attempt to impose traffic regulation orders on residents.
- Residents were refusing to accept Tesco imposing parking restrictions on residents parking outside their own properties.
- Tesco was ignoring the views of thousands of people.
- The development would not be sustainable.
- There would be an increase of traffic in the area in particular in respect of delivery lorries which would have an effect on residents.
- Home delivery lorries would also be leaving the site.
- The development would be bad for the future of children and the planet.
- Sacred Heart Primary School was situated on Valley Drive which was the main access to the site.
- There would be health and safety risks to children, staff as well as parents as a result of the development.
- It was noted that Tesco had suggested some measures to mitigate the situation.
- There would also be problems of off-road parking which included parents that were dropping off their children at school.
- There would need to be a 20 mph zone, with additional signs.
- The majority of the residents of the area were against the development.
- The development was out of scale and would have a disastrous effect on the surrounding community.
- Tesco arguments in favour of the development were flawed.
- There were other stores that were able to fill the retail gap.
- Eighty per cent of businesses had indicated that they might consider leaving Ilkley for other areas if the development was approved.
- It was unlikely that people would walk from the proposed new Tesco supermarket to the town centre.
- An independent retail study had recommended that planning permission be refused.
- Ilkley was a spa town dominated by small traders.
- Tesco would take 7% of the high street retail market.
- It would be a better proposal to have a science park in the area of the proposed Tesco development as this would help to generate employment.
- The application should be refused.
- There were objections to the development on design grounds.
- Ilkley was distinct and any development needed to complement the town.
- The Tesco development would be dominant.
- It was a typical Tesco store and would be a blot on the landscape in perpetuity.

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

- The proposed store would be too big for Ilkley.
- There was a Tesco store at Skipton six miles away.
- The design of the proposed building would not be conducive to the surrounding area.
- The application should be refused.

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

- He congratulated Bradford Council officers on the report.
- The application had been discussed at an Ilkley Parish Council meeting.
- A large number of Ilkley residents had signed a petition opposing the Tesco development.
- The loss of employment land was significant.

- It was not good to bunch all the supermarket stores in one area and there were other stores that were available in Ilkley.
- There would be an adverse impact on the surrounding area if the development was approved.
- It was necessary to ensure the safety of pedestrians.
- It seemed the whole town was being disrupted to fit in with the proposed store.
- There would be light pollution as the area was already like a floodlit football pitch.
- The sheer size of the proposed store was unacceptable.
- Whether yellow lines were painted or not the development would still have a massive impact on residents.
- A great big warehouse was not necessary in the town which would be the case if the store was approved.
- He supported the recommendation of Bradford Council Planning Officers in respect of this application.

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

- Tesco recognised that there was a lot of opposition to their proposals.
- Twenty brave persons had written in support of the Tesco development proposals.
- There were benefits to the scheme and she was concerned that the committee report did not refer to Planning Policy PPS6 in respect of the physical, employment, economic and social inclusion aspects of the development.
- Tesco has been in the area of Ilkley for a number of years and was a local employer which proposed to invest £25 million in the town.
- There would be a creation of 235 new full and part time jobs.
- The derelict building would be sorted out and a modern food store would be available to residents of Ilkley.
- There would be an improvement in carbon emissions.
- The site would resume its industrial use.
- A number of parking spaces would be provided.
- There would be new signals at the junction and improvements to the existing footbridge over the railway.
- There would be provision of an additional Sunday bus service.
- Tesco's household survey had indicated that 25% of people leave Ilkley to shop elsewhere but 60% of people leave Ilkley to do their non-food shopping.
- People wanted a store with adequate parking facilities as well as a modern food store for their weekly shop.
- It was not possible to do a lot with the existing Tesco site as it was too narrow and there was a lack of space available.
- Ilkley was threatened by the current economic climate and it does have a good quality retail base.
- Discussions had taken place with planning officers to consider reducing the size of the store.
- Any traffic concerns could be accommodated.
- People tended to go to alternative supermarket stores if the provision at Tesco was not diverse enough.
- Tesco was keen to improve the shopping experience for residents in Ilkley.

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

- She urged the panel to support the officer recommendations.
- The Ilkley economy was reliant on the quality of life of residents and those who visit

the town centre.

- It was important to prevent the town centre from being spoilt for all its residents and visitors as it was currently a healthy and vibrant town centre.
- Food store provision in the town centre was good.
- The town centre was currently more fragile due to the current economic climate.
- The application was for a store outside Ilkley Town Centre.
- The development would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of residents of Ilkley.
- A supermarket should not be built on a non-restricted road.
- There were a lot of young persons with families and also older residents at Railway Road and Mayfield Road.
- There would be an increase in pollution in the area.
- The proposed highway changes were unacceptable.
- The design of the proposed store was unacceptable and it was in the centre of a conservation area of an important town centre.
- She recommended refusal of the application.
- The concerns of residents should be taken into account in respect of highways, loss of amenity and the economic value of the town issues.
- She recommended that a site visit be held.

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

- Seventy five trees would be removed and 33 were covered by tree preservation orders.
- The trees do have a group value rather than an individual value.
- Tesco had made changes to the design.
- All the affected streets were residential streets.
- Most of the houses were terraced houses without alternative parking.
- There would be an increase in traffic.
- Traffic regulation orders would be detrimental to residents.
- The area was used as a rat-run and the residents were worried about the volume of traffic.
- There was also concern about vehicle deliveries.
- Any request for traffic regulation orders would be referred to the area committee and objections could be made by the Parish Council or any other person.
- It was not possible to determine how many home delivery and other commercial vehicles there would be coming to and from the site.
- Traffic regulation orders would be needed for safety reasons.
- People do tend to park their vehicles on the pavement as some of the streets were narrow and traffic regulation orders would resolve in less parking for residents.
- There would be an increase in congestion.
- Physical measures would have to be implemented to enforce any 20 mph zone.
- The site was not allocated specifically for employment use.
- The retail consultant reported that just because people shopped at other supermarkets it did not provide justification for doubling the size of another supermarket which would dominate the surrounding area.
- The proposed development would have a knock on impact on existing provision.
- There was no evidence available that there was a need for a larger Tesco development.

The Council's legal representative made the following points:

- If the application was approved then a Section 106 Agreement would be required to ensure the development could not commence until the traffic regulation orders were approved by the appropriate area committee and was funded by the developer.
- Any changes in the size of the proposed development would be a material change to the application and would need to be advertised.

Following a site visit Members made the following comments:

- The proposal was considered unacceptable as it was located in an out of centre location, outside the central shopping area of the town centre and outside the identified town centre expansion sites.
- It was considered that the proposed scheme was unacceptable in that, due to highway congestion and traffic on the highway network in the vicinity of the new store and at the junction of The Grove/Springs Lane/Brook Street, Brook Street/Railway Road and Brook Street/Church Street/A65 Leeds Road, there would be undue noise and disturbance in close proximity to existing residential properties which would be detrimental to established residential amenities.
- The introduction of any traffic regulation orders would result in the displacement of on-street parking for residents to the detriment of established residential amenities.
- The proposals were considered to be out of scale and built in inappropriate materials for this locality of two storey residential properties which would lead to an overdominant and obtrusive building in this residential street scene.
- There were concerns about the effect of the development on the local school.
- There would be a lot of vehicles coming off the road and significant consideration was not given to the vicinity of the school.

The Economic Development Officer reported that the planning inspector would take into account the number of jobs lost if the application was refused. The government was in the process of consolidating planning and economic development policies and it did acknowledge the role supermarkets had in the provision of jobs.

The Council's legal representative confirmed that the site in question was an unallocated site that had employment use in the past.

The Design Officer confirmed that the development was a big building on a "squashed up" site and he was happy with the colour and materials that would be used.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that Tesco had offered a package of highway safety improvements measures.

The Council's legal representative confirmed that any mitigation measures would have to be put in before any development work commenced.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The proposal is considered unacceptable in that it is located in an out-of centre location, outside the central shopping centre of the town centre and outside the identified town centre expansion sites. The Council's retail**

strategy is to sustain and enhance the centres and the proposed development fails to demonstrate that need, and that appropriateness of scale, the sequential approach and impacts on the vitality and viability of the town centre have been satisfied, as such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies UDP6, CR1A and CR4A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and Planning Policy Statement 6.

- (2) **It is considered that the proposed scheme is unacceptable in that, due to highway congestion and traffic on the highway network in the vicinity of the new store and at the junction of The Grove/Springs Lane/Brook Street, Brook Street/Railway Road and Brook Street/Church Street / A65 Leeds Road, there would be undue noise and disturbance in close proximity to existing residential properties which would be detrimental to established residential amenities. Moreover, in order to ensure highway and pedestrian safety a substantial number of traffic regulation orders are required around the residential roads leading to and from, and around the site and are necessary to facilitate safe access. It is however considered that this will result in the displacement of on-street parking for residents to the detriment of established residential amenities. As such, the proposal is considered to the contrary to policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**
- (3) **The proposals are considered to be out of scale and built in inappropriate materials for this locality of two storey residential properties which will lead to an overdominant and obtrusive building in this residential street scene and is contrary to Policies UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

The Chair thanked all the members of the audience, objectors, officers and representatives from Tesco for their assistance in ensuring the smooth running of the meeting in respect of the above two applications.

26. 14 YEWBANK TERRACE, ILKLEY

Ilkley

A full planning application for a single storey, conservatory extension at 14 Yewbank Terrace, Ilkley – 09/01156/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. The application was reported to the Panel because of the involvement of a Member of Bradford Council.

He reported that representations had not been received from Ilkley Parish Council at the time of production of the report and no other representations had been received in respect of this application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposal had overcome previous reasons for refusal, and would have no detrimental effect on either the character of the Ilkley Conservation Area, or the health of nearby protected trees. Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal was acceptable having regard to RUDP Policies UDP3, UR3, D1, BH7 and NE4/NE5/NE6. He therefore recommended approval of the application.

Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

27. 2 COLES WAY, RIDDLESDEN

Keighley East

A full planning application for a two storey extension to the rear of the property, canopy and new door to the front of 2 Coles Way, Riddlesden, Keighley – 09/02627/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout. He reported that Keighley Town Council had not provided comments on the application and that no comments have been received from neighbours or other parties in respect of the application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed two storey extension, canopy and a new door would relate satisfactorily to the character of the existing dwelling and adjacent properties. The impact of the proposal upon the occupants of neighbouring properties had been assessed and it was considered that it would not have a detrimental adverse effect upon their residential amenity. This proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policies UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2005 and the Council's Revised House Extensions Policy 2003. He therefore recommended that subject to conditions the application be approved.

Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

28. REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT / PROSECUTION ACTION

(i) 2 UPPER ISLE FARM LANE, OXENHOPE, KEIGHLEY

Worth Valley

Unauthorised manège at Upper Isle Farm, Oxenhope, Keighley – 07/00221/ENFCOU.

An enforcement notice was served and appealed. The appeal was withdrawn on 14th July 2009, the terms of the Notice having been complied with by that date.

(ii) 3 GILLSTONE DRIVE, HAWORTH, KEIGHLEY

Worth Valley

Motor vehicle repairs are being conducted from a residential property
– 08/01477/ENFCOU

The use of a private dwelling for the repair of motor vehicles was considered wholly inappropriate within a residential area as a consequence of disturbance generated by customers, delivery of parts and noise generated during works.

The owner has been requested to cease the use but had not complied.

The Assistant Director Corporate Services (City Solicitor) has therefore been instructed to issue an enforcement notice.

(iii) ALBERT HOTEL, BRIDGE STREET, KEIGHLEY

Keighley Central

A smoking shelter has been erected to the rear of The Albert Hotel, Bridge Street, Keighley and within the Keighley Conservation Area – 08/01317/ENFUNA

The shelter has been erected without the benefit of planning permission and was considered to be an alien feature, which due to its materials and design looks cluttered and incongruous and introduces an unsympathetic form detracting from the character and appearance of the area and the visual amenity of the Keighley Conservation Area.

The owner has been requested to remove it but has not complied.

The Assistant Director, Corporate Services (City Solicitor) has been instructed to serve an enforcement notice.

(iv) CRINGLES CARAVAN PARK, BOLTON ROAD, SILSDEN

Craven

Unauthorised porta-cabin – 06/01109/ENFUNA

An enforcement notice was served and appealed. The Inspector dismissed the appeal but granted time for removal of the structure by 12 July 2009.

The porta-cabin was removed from the site by low loader on Friday 10 July 2009. The notice has therefore been complied with and no further action was required.

(v) & (vi) NEW ROAD SIDE GARAGE, 155 HALIFAX ROAD, KEIGHLEY

Keighley East

PR Motors (car sales), 155 Halifax Road– 09/00834/ENFCOU.

An area of grassed land alongside Halifax Road and within the Green Belt had been removed and replaced by a hard standing of crushed stone for the purpose of stationing motor vehicles associated with car sales. The breach constitutes unauthorised development and change of use and was considered to be inappropriate within the Green Belt.

The owner has been requested to cease the use and restore the land but had not complied.

The Assistant Director, Corporate Services (City Solicitor) has been instructed to serve an enforcement notice.

Resolved –

That the reports be noted.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

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

APPEALS DISMISSED

(i) **41 BRACKEN BANK GROVE, KEIGHLEY** **Keighley West**

Construction of a detached dwelling to the side - Case No: 09/00451/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 09/00057/APPFUL.

(ii) **LAND TO THE EAST OF IVY BANK MILL LANE, HAWORTH** **Worth Valley**

Construction of six cottages arranged in two blocks of three (amended plans) - Case No: 07/09251/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 09/00056/APPFUL.

(iii) **SECOND FLOOR 17 LAWKHOLME CRESCENT, KEIGHLEY** **Keighley Central**

Change of use from office to taxi booking office - Case No: 08/05940/COU.

Appeal Ref: 09/00054/APPCOU.

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

NO ACTION

Chair

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

minutes\plk3aug

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