

## Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 29 August 2018 in the Council Chamber - Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 10.05 am  
Concluded 1.25 pm

### Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	THE INDEPENDENTS
Rickard Brown	Lee Abid Hussain Godwin V Greenwood	Naylor

Observers: Councillor M Smith (Minute 16(a) and (g)), Councillor Davies (Minute 16(d)) and Councillor Hawkesworth (Minute 16 (g))

Apologies: Councillor Beverley Mullaney and Councillor Naveed Riaz

### Councillor Lee in the Chair

#### 12. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor V Greenwood disclosed that, as part of her employment, she had dealt with a number of complaints regarding fines issued at the Car Park, Oastler Road, Shipley (Minute 16(b)) and she therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item in accordance with the requirements of the Members' Code of Conduct (Part 4A of the Constitution) and the Members' Planning Code of Conduct (Part 4B of the Constitution).

Councillor Rickard disclosed that, as a member of Ilkley Town Council Planning Committee, he had expressed views on the application in relation to The Sidings, Station Approach, Ben Rydding, Ilkley (Minute 16(g)) and he therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item in accordance with the requirements of the Members' Code of Conduct (Part 4A of the Constitution) and the Members' Planning Code of Conduct (Part 4B of the Constitution).

Councillors V Greenwood, Rickard and Lee disclosed, in the interests of transparency, that they had received emails in relation to a number of applications for consideration but had not read or responded to them.

During the meeting, and in the interests of transparency, Councillor Lee disclosed

that she was a practising Catholic in relation to The Holy Family Catholic School, Spring Gardens Lane, Keighley application (Minute 16(f)).

During the meeting, and in the interests of transparency, Councillor Abid Hussain disclosed that The Holy Family Catholic School, Spring Gardens Lane, Keighley application (Minute 16(f)) was in his Ward (Keighley Central) but he had not discussed the application with any interested parties.

***Action: City Solicitor***

**13. MINUTES**

**Resolved –**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2018 be signed as a correct record.**

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

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

**15. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

**16. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL**

The Strategic Director, Place presented **Document “E”**. Plans and photographs were displayed in respect of each application and representations summarised.

**(a) 2 Clifton Road, Ilkley**

**Ilkley**

Full application for the demolition of an existing detached garage and construction of a dwelling within the rear garden of 2 Clifton Road, Ilkley - 18/01858/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that there was a large Victorian detached dwelling already on the site, which was located on the corner of Clifton Road and Wheatley Road. The existing property, although not a listed building nor within a Conservation Area, was considered to contribute significantly to the character of the area and this issue had been carefully considered with regard to the proposal. He explained that the existing house had two separate accesses therefore a new access point was not required; the new house would take its access from Wheatley Road. He considered the proposed house would sit comfortably beside the neighbouring property at 7 Wheatley Road and stated there would be a retaining wall between them. The application had received three representations in objection which included one from a Ward Councillor who had requested that the application be referred to the Area Planning Panel if recommended for approval. With regard to concerns raised by objectors about the impact on the neighbouring house at 7 Wheatley Road, he stated that the proposed house would sit below the level of the neighbouring property and there

were no habitable room windows proposed on the side boundary. In relation to objections referring to the loss of trees, he stated that the applicant had submitted an arboricultural assessment which stated that no trees on the site were subject to Tree Preservation Orders. The report also presented measures for tree protection as part of the application which would ensure sufficient planting would be retained within the garden; a condition was also proposed to ensure adequate tree protection measures. He did not consider the loss of trees on the site to be significant and stated that there would be sufficient screening on the site. The application was then recommended for approval.

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

- The proposal would cause the loss of suitable amenity space for the existing property on the site.
- Ilkley Civic Society had also raised concerns due to the site being on the fringe of a Conservation Area and due to the Victorian style of the existing house.
- Trees had already been removed on the site and the proposal would cause further tree losses.
- The style of house proposed was considered a poor design in comparison to the houses within the surrounding area.
- He expressed concerns regarding car parking space.
- He considered the proposal to be overdevelopment and detrimental to the local area.

In response to a Member's questions, the Strategic Director, Place reiterated that the application site was not located within a Conservation Area and that the application had been submitted by the resident of the main dwelling at 2 Clifton Road.

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

- She was representing the views of Ilkley Civic Society.
- Ilkley Civic Society were concerned about the loss of architecture and land in Ilkley and wanted 2 Clifton Road to become a listed building.
- 2 Clifton Road was an important house in the locality and the proposed new house in its garden area was considered to compromise the host dwelling.

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

- The proposal had been developed with great sensitivity to the street scene.
- Pre-application advice from planning officers had been taken on board prior to submitting the application.
- 2 Clifton Road was not a listed building and the site was located 140 metres away from the edge of a Conservation Area.
- The proposal included adequate car parking spaces and a turning head within the site.
- The well maintained gardens on the site would not be affected by the proposal.
- The proposal would not remove the principle garden space of the host dwelling as it would be built in the area where the existing detached garage

- was located.
- The proposal incorporated contemporary elements for the current market and would sit sensitively between the host and neighbouring dwellings.
- The ridge height of the proposal would sit below those of the host and neighbouring properties.
- None of the trees on the site were protected by Tree Preservation Orders but efforts would be made to protect the existing trees on the site.
- There had been no objections raised in relation to the trees by the Local Authority.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that no enforcement action could be taken in relation to the removal of trees on the site because none of the trees were protected by Tree Preservation Orders and that no issues had been raised by the Local Authority in relation to drainage.

**Resolved –**

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

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(b) Car Park, Oastler Road, Shipley**

**Shipley**

Application for a change of use of parts of the adopted highway to privately managed car parking spaces and curtilage for adjoining shop at land at Oastler Road, Saltaire, Shipley - 18/02769/FUL

The Chair stated that the application was before the Panel for determination following a request from a Ward Councillor. She commented that, in such cases, she would prefer those Councillors to attend the meeting.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He stated that there had been a considerable amount of public interest in the application which had received 88 objections and a further 12 since the report had been published. He described the site and its location. Members were informed that: there had been a number of car parking spaces on the site, previously operated by the Council on a pay and display basis; the site had been acquired by the applicant in 2017 following which a number of fines had been issued which had caused some controversy at the time; Oastler Road was an adopted highway off Bingley Road; it was located behind shop units, including the Co-Op convenience store, and re-emerged onto the main road; a one-way system was in operation; and the site was located in the centre of Saltaire but was not within the Saltaire World Heritage Site Conservation Area. The application was for the change of use of an adopted highway to a private car park. A previous application had been refused because it had proposed the loss of Oastler Road as a thoroughfare which had been considered detrimental to highway safety. The application presented a revised proposal which would retain Oastler Road as a thoroughfare and public highway and maintain the existing one-way system and double yellow lines. The applicant had submitted swept path drawings showing that Oastler Road would continue to be

capable of accommodating the same delivery vehicles and other traffic movements that it did currently. He stated that the majority of the objections had referred to the site being an important facility for local businesses, residents and visitors and had expressed concern regarding the fines that had been issued in the past. A Ward Councillor had suggested a number of conditions, as outlined in the report, however, he did not consider them to be appropriate in terms of planning or land use. He stated that the issue for determination was whether the land was appropriate to undergo a change of use to become a private car park which he considered it was and therefore recommended the application for approval.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that he did not consider there would be any problems relating to the access for delivery vehicles and he confirmed that the car parking spaces marked as 'reserved spaces' were private areas allocated to the flats above the shop unit and they did not form part of the application and would remain unchanged.

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

- At the time of acquiring the land, the applicant had considered it was best to put in place controls in the car park and had therefore contracted a private parking company to put measures in place.
- The applicant had always been concerned about maintaining Oastler Road as a shopping destination.
- The applicant would return to providing 20 minutes free car parking on the site.
- The applicant had no intention of issuing penalty charge notices in the same manner as was previously the case.
- At present, users of the car park could park their vehicles there all day which was not an effective use nor beneficial for local businesses.
- The applicant wanted a scheme in place that worked for everybody.
- The private parking spaces currently on the site would remain as they were for the residents of the flats above the shops.
- There would be enough space for wagons to unload behind the Co-Op and for cars to enter and exit the car park.
- Deliveries to the Co-Op often took place around 5.00pm/6.00pm.

**Resolved –**

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

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(c) Former annexe structure, land at Main Street, Wharfedale  
Menston, Ilkley**

Full application for the construction of detached dwelling utilising existing access from Main Street and to include the demolition of the former annexe at Main Street, Menston, Ilkley – 18/01686/FUL

The Chair stated that Councillor Dale Smith had put in a late request to speak on this item as a Ward Councillor but as he had not been present at the start of the meeting to indicate so she was not allowing him to make representation.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the proposal included the demolition of an existing annexe building which was attached to the neighbouring property at 91 Main Street. The annexe was a stone built, single storey outbuilding which was set well back from the street behind a stone boundary wall and vegetation. He stated that although the properties to either side were traditional cottages and houses, the site was not within a Conservation Area and the annexe was not a listed building. The back gardens of 16 and 18 Croft Rise adjoined the application site and he considered them to be the most directly affected by the proposals. 89 Main Street included a number of side windows at a distance of approximately 7 metres from the side of the proposed dwelling which would face an en-suite bathroom window and a secondary window to a bedroom, both of which were proposed to be obscure glazed. He described the site as an infill plot with good access to village services. He explained that planning permission had previously been granted for the conversion and extension of the existing annexe to form a separate dwelling but the applicant now wanted to develop a larger house on the plot for which an application had previously been refused on design grounds. The proposed new dwelling would be a detached, five bedroom house with a traditional appearance to the front elevation facing Main Street and would include use of stone and slate materials. The proposal included forming a new drive access off Main Street. Menston Parish Council did not consider the application to address the previous reasons for refusal and raised particular concern in relation to the choice of stone and the balcony to the rear. The application had received seven representations in objection which included one from a Ward Councillor and the objections had related to the design and massing of the proposed house, concerns that the house would be out of keeping with the local character of the area and concerns of overlooking onto neighbouring properties. He considered that the proposal would sit comfortably on the site and whilst some overlooking would arise from the proposal, he stated it would be positioned at distances from the boundary considered acceptable by established guidance. He then recommended the application for approval.

In response to a Member's questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that a standard condition could be imposed to restrict the time of day for construction work to be carried out if Members considered it necessary.

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

- There was little difference between this application and the one previously refused on grounds of visual impact in March 2018.
- Overshadowing on 89 Main Street (Willow House Farm) was a major concern

as the gable of the proposed house would only be 7.25m away from one of its habitable room windows.

- The size of the proposed house was too large and it would overshadow 89 Main Street and overlook onto houses on Croft Rise.
- Although the distances from the neighbouring properties met the guidelines, the applicant intended to build a balcony and residents were concerned of the overlooking onto their properties that this would result in.
- The dormer windows and flat roof design of the proposed house contravened the Village Design Statement.
- A slate roof was proposed whereas neighbouring properties had stone roofs.
- He urged the Panel to refuse the application.

The Strategic Director, Place stated that the position of the proposed dwelling had been amended since the previous application and it was considered to be positioned better in relation to the neighbouring cottages. He stated that the applicant had submitted documents showing how the proposal would sit on the site which accorded with established guidance in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document. He considered the proposed dormer windows to be acceptable for a modern building. He also clarified that the proposal included a recessed covered balcony to its rear elevation above the garage, which did not project out, and that the separation distance from the neighbouring properties was considered acceptable.

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

- He was representing the views of a number of neighbours to the application site.
- He suggested Members undertook a site visit to see the impact the proposal would have on neighbouring properties, particularly 89 Main Street and 16 and 18 Croft Rise.
- Whilst the site had planning permission for the development of a house, the proposed five bedroom luxury house was too large for the site.
- The design and scale of the proposal was out of keeping with the local area and would be higher than the houses on Croft Rise and only 125mm lower than the neighbouring house at 89 Main Street.
- A previous application had been refused due to the roof height and he considered that the current amended proposal had not been reduced significantly enough.
- He considered the images shown during the officer's presentation to be incorrect and stated they had not shown how the proposal would look from the North and West.
- The current annexe had a subordinate relationship with the neighbouring properties in relation to its scale, height and massing and it was important that any proposed development maintained this.
- Although the plans had been amended, the proposal was still 1.7 metres higher than the neighbouring cottages.
- The proposal contravened a number of design principles contained in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document.
- The proposal would overshadow 89 Main Street and cause loss of privacy.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place stated that

there was a tree overhanging the back corner of the site which was rooted in a neighbouring property and that the proposal would sit 11.5 metres away from that edge. He said a condition could be imposed to ensure the roots of the tree were protected during the construction phase if Members were minded to approve the application.

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

- He stated that the officer's report was comprehensive and he welcomed the recommendation for approval.
- Since the refusal of the previous application he had worked with officers to produce an acceptable proposal which included a reduced ridge height and the removal of a prominent gable feature.
- The proposal accorded with the Core Strategy Development Plan Document policies and the separation distances were sufficient.
- Works already undertaken on the site had been done with consent.
- He urged Members to approve the application.

#### **Resolved –**

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

- (i) Notwithstanding details shown on the approved drawings, the roof materials shall be similar to the stone slates used on adjoining buildings.**
- (ii) The development shall not begin, nor shall there be any demolition, site preparation or ground works, nor shall any materials or machinery be brought on to the site until tree protection fencing and/or other tree protection measures have been installed around the root protection areas of all trees retained within and adjoining the site, including the tree towards the rear of the adjoining property at Willow House Farm. The protective fencing and other tree protection measures shall be installed in accordance with an Arboricultural Method Statement to BS 5837 that shall first be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**
- (iii) No ground works, development or demolition shall begin until the Local Planning Authority has inspected and given its written confirmation that the agreed tree protection measures have been installed in accordance with those details.**
- (iv) The protective fencing and/or other tree protection measures shall be retained in place for the duration of all construction works.**
- (v) Construction work shall only be carried out between the hours of 0730 and 1800 on Mondays to Fridays, 0730 and 1300 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless specifically agreed otherwise in writing by the Local**

## **Planning Authority.**

### ***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

#### **(d) Land at Tong Park, Baildon**

#### **Baildon**

Full application for the construction of two detached dwellings on land at Tong Park Street, Tong Park, Baildon - 18/02249/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that Tong Park Street was an unmade and un-adopted road leading off Otley Road, Baildon. It was wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic along most of its length. There were a cluster of stone built dwellings to the north of the site. The proposal was for the construction of two conventional detached large dwellings with seven bedrooms that would appear as two stories in height with bedrooms created in the roof space. He stated that a previously withdrawn application had not been supported by officers due to its modern design which was considered out of keeping with the character of the existing buildings in the area. He stated that the site was not within a designated Green Belt area and it was unallocated within the Replacement Unitary Development Plan but stressed the need for additional housing in the District and considered the site suitable. The application had received 14 representations in objection from local residents and objections had also been received from a Ward Councillor and the MP for Shipley. He reported that an additional objection had been received since his report was written from the occupiers of The Beeches, located on Tong Park, and he read out their submission which stated that they disagreed with the consultation response from Highways Development Control as it did not address access issues from Otley Road; in relation to increased traffic, the proposal was expected to result in 22 two-way movements per day; the access for vehicles was narrow and uneven; the additional traffic would create significant issues; the vegetation clearance would impact negatively on wildlife on the site; the proposal did not improve pedestrian safety; and they urged Members to undertake a site visit. He stated that despite concerns raised in relation to highway safety, Highways Development Control, having considered the means of access from Otley Road, had not raised any significant highways issues. A condition was proposed in relation to ensuring access leading to the site was implemented prior to its use which would improve the immediate frontage. Objectors had claimed that trees had been removed from the site, however, as there were no trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders on the site, permission had not been required prior to their removal. He then recommended the application for approval.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that:

- Cars that had been seen parked near the Otley Road/Tong Park Street junction, opposite the petrol station, belonged to a car sales garage located nearby.
- There was nothing to prevent the houses being used as holiday homes as permission would not be required to do so because they would still be classed as dwellings.
- If a proposed dwelling was used as two homes planning permission would be

required and consideration would be given to the implications on the highway of an additional house.

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

- The site was in a semi-rural location, located near two and three bedroom homes constructed in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries which were out of keeping with modern housing.
- The access was via a fork in the road which was long, covered in pot holes, lacking a passing place for vehicles, lacking pavement for pedestrians, without drainage and with very little lighting.
- The access onto Otley Road was very difficult for drivers when making a right turn and they often turned left and made a right turn via the petrol station which was not desirable.
- She considered it was unlikely that the occupiers of the proposed houses would use public transport.
- A previous planning application for the site had been refused and that decision was upheld by the Planning Inspector; she did not consider this application to be significantly different.

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

- He lived in a neighbouring property.
- The main concern for residents was the increased volume of traffic from the proposed development and the access problems it would cause.
- He did not agree with the statement in the officer's report which said that the access was sufficient.
- Tong Park Street was not wide enough for two cars to pass each other.
- The increased traffic would cause a danger to walkers, ramblers and cyclists that frequented Tong Park Street.
- He estimated that there could be up to 10 cars from the two dwellings and additional visitor cars.
- Visibility was poor on the un-adopted road.
- Even if the trees on the access to the site were removed and the height of the stone boundary was a maximum of 1 metre, the visibility would still be poor and very dangerous for vehicular access.
- It often took 5-10 minutes to access Otley Road from Tong Park Street at busy times and this time would be increased with additional traffic.
- He considered the accident rate would increase if there was more traffic using the access road.

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

- The proposal would contribute to the district's housing supply.
- The Local Planning Authority had not raised any objections on highway or drainage grounds.
- Each dwelling would contain a private garage.
- The proposal did not present any overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring residents.
- Following guidance from officers, the proposed dwellings would have a traditional appearance and natural stone and slate materials would be used.

- He considered the application addressed concerns raised in relation to the previously refused application.
- He considered there were no planning grounds on which to refuse the application.

In response to a Member's question, it was reported that the maintenance of the un-adopted road was the responsibility of the residents and that it was not appropriate, due to the size of the proposed development, to require the applicant to make improvements to the whole of the access road as part of this application.

A Member commented that he considered the access road to be unsatisfactory for a development of this size.

**Resolved –**

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

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(e) Oddfellows Hall Hotel, 125 Otley Road,  
Shipley**

**Shipley**

Full application for the demolition of a disused public house, Oddfellows Hall Hotel, 125 Otley Road, Shipley - 18/02784/FUL

The Chair stated that the application was before the Panel for determination following a request from a Ward Councillor. She commented that, in such cases, she would prefer those Councillors to attend the meeting.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that, following a change in legislation, the demolition of public houses required planning permission which the owner stated he was unaware of. Preparation works to demolish the site had begun and were reported to the Planning Department by a Ward Councillor. Works had subsequently ceased and a planning application had been submitted. The building currently had scaffolding around it. The former public house had been boarded up for several years and disused since at least 2013. The applicant had purchased the building in April 2014. The building had recently been subject to thefts during which materials had been stripped from the building, and the owner had had to improve security to try to prevent access. The building was in a poor state and the internal walls were in a precarious condition. A Structural Report stated that due to the stripping of internal floor boards, which had been the result of theft, some of the external walls were showing signs of movement. The loss of the public house was not considered to cause a material impact on the community given the availability of alternative facilities nearby and the fact that it had been disused for many years. He stated that the building had not been nominated as an Asset of Community Value under the Localism Act 2011. The site was located in the Saltaire World Heritage Site Buffer Zone but the proposal was not considered to affect the significance of the World Heritage Site. The site was not within a Conservation Area or a listed building. The application had

received 17 representations in objection which included one from a Ward Councillor and the objections had related to heritage issues and preservation of the building, however, it was considered that there were no heritage grounds to justify refusal of permission for the demolition of the building and that the re-use of the building was an unrealistic prospect given its condition. He then recommended that the application be approved.

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

- A Ward Councillor had notified the Local Planning Authority of the demolition work being undertaken on the site on 1 July 2018, yet it had continued for days afterwards which undermined the planning process.
- The Oddfellows Public House was a landmark building in Shipley and part of the town's heritage.
- In 1852 a meeting had taken place in the building which had led to the creation of the Shipley Board of Health.
- The site was on a route to Salts Mill and located in the Saltaire World Heritage Site Buffer Zone.
- Although the building was not currently listed, Historic England were considering whether it should be and he urged the Panel to defer its decision on the application until a decision had been made by Historic England.

The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and stated that another break in had recently taken place and he was concerned that someone may get hurt entering the building illegally due to its state of disrepair if action was not taken soon.

A Member commented that the building was in a dangerous state and someone could get hurt or killed. He then moved that the application be approved for the demolition of the building.

**Resolved –**

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

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(f) The Holy Family Catholic School,  
Spring Gardens Lane, Keighley**

**Keighley  
Central**

Full application for the construction of a 3rd generation (3G) synthetic turf hockey pitch with associated features including a club house, specialist sports lighting, perimeter fencing and access features - 17/06927/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the site was a secondary school adjacent to Spring Gardens Lane and that the main entrance to the school would remain unchanged. The school was built on rising ground and included playing pitches which were cut into a hillside. The proposed hockey pitch would be located beyond a cluster of school buildings and set back from the existing

stone wall bordering the pavement to Spring Gardens Lane. There were a line of trees along the road frontage and there were residential properties along Spring Gardens Lane. There was a public footpath north-west of the site leading up to Hawkstone Drive which was concealed by mature trees and beyond which were the back gardens of properties on Glenlyon Drive. Eight floodlights, 15 metres in height, were proposed as part of the application. The proposed two storey club house would include changing room, shower and toilet facilities on the ground floor and an office and meeting/function room on the first floor. The proposal had been submitted by the school in partnership with a local hockey club with the intent that it would be used by the school during school hours and the club on evenings and weekends. The land was designated as playing fields in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. The proposed artificial pitch would allow all year round use enabling increased usage. The proposal had been discussed with Sport England who had confirmed the proposal was acceptable in terms of providing sufficient provision for its use and requested that the amount of grass pitch on the school grounds remained the same. The application had received 39 representations in objection and three in support. A petition has also been submitted in objection to the proposal containing 53 signatures. Concerns raised by objectors related to the impact on the landscape, noise pollution and excavation during construction among other things. He stated that the proposal would require the movement of earth which was 2 metres in height on the site's hillside to level it off for the pitch. The trees on the frontage of the site would remain in place and the tree officer was confident that the trees would be protected during construction. A condition was proposed for additional tree planting/landscaping to be carried out prior to the use of the playing field. A drawing had been submitted from a specialist light engineer stating that the light from the proposed floodlighting would be retained within the school's site. A condition was proposed for additional details pertaining to the floodlighting to ensure there would be no light pollution to nearby residents and to restrict the times at which they could be used. He considered the lighting would not significantly impact upon adjacent residential properties. Objectors had raised concerns that school traffic on Spring Gardens Lane would be further aggravated, however, the applicant had submitted a Parking Management Strategy outlining that the hockey club would only be using the site out of school hours. He explained that the strategy also identified a location for overspill parking within the school site which would be used for events which attracted large audiences. He considered the proposal acceptable on highway grounds and stated that, on balance, and considering the benefits of a 3G pitch on the site, he recommended the application for approval.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated there were no age restrictions on the proposed facilities, the use of the pitch would be controlled by the school and the pitch would be able to facilitate other sports in addition to hockey and could be used as one large pitch or two small pitches.

A Member expressed concern that the Panel were considering the application without the final details in relation to the floodlighting and were unable to ensure the lighting would be appropriate. In response the Strategic Director, Place stated that there was a proposed condition relating to floodlighting and that the Local Planning Authority would therefore retain control.

A Member raised concern about the noise that residents living near the site would

be able to hear when the pitch was in use.

In response to a Member's question, the City Solicitor stated that whilst the applicant was not applying for an alcohol licence for the proposed clubhouse, there was nothing to stop members of the clubhouse bringing their own alcohol to consume on the site.

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

- Keighley Town Council had considered and opposed the application due to the number of complaints received and the petition in objection.
- The facility would be open for use seven days a week, 8.00am-10.00pm.
- The eight floodlights would be 50 foot high and 33 foot above the top of the boundary fence.
- At the time the application was considered by Keighley Town Council there were no conditions attached to the application of which there were now 12.

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

- Clarification was needed on the type of pitch proposed as hockey could not be played on a 3G pitch.
- She had contacted Sport England and they had stated that the proposal was for a sand dressed Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP).
- There had been no site notices placed on Spring Gardens Lane or Glenlyon Drive in relation to the proposal and she had only been made aware of the application from an invitation to a meeting sent to residents by the school.
- When residents had been made aware of the application by the school they had only nine days to submit their objections and petition.
- The height of the structure would be damaging to the area and residents would potentially be subjected to the pitch being used all year round as well as six hours of floodlighting in the winter months.
- The trees on the site's boundary were all deciduous.
- Hockey was a winter game and the trees would not protect against noise pollution.
- There was a lot of traffic on Spring Gardens Lane during school drop off and pick up times and vehicles were often parked over the 'keep clear' markings on the road in front of the school.
- She raised concern about the car parking arrangements for users of the hockey pitch as car parking was an issue in the area already.
- She raised concern in relation to how assurances would be made to ensure that the conditions were carried out satisfactorily.
- She urged Members of the Panel to refuse the application.

Members sought clarification on the type of pitch proposed and what type of sports it could accommodate. Members also asked for further details in relation to the floodlighting.

In response to a Member's question, a representative of the applicant stated that 3G was a generic term used for the proposed sand dressed Artificial Grass Pitch and that small ball sports could be played on the proposed pitch.

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

- He passed on the apologies of the Head Teacher of Holy Family Catholic School who was intending on make representation at the meeting but had suffered a family bereavement.
- The footpath near the site was a permissive, not public, footpath and was therefore not a public right of way.
- He agreed with the officer's recommendation and urged Members to approve the application.
- The school had missed out on Building Schools for the Future funding.
- Efforts were being made to upgrade the 1960's built school to modern standards, piecemeal.
- The Holy Family Catholic School was a community minded school.
- The proposed usage hours match those of a local sports hall in order for them to run cohesively.
- The school were mindful of noise from the site and had previously ceased use of their pitch by a football club due to the noise disruption.
- Sport England considered the proposal appropriate to enhance sport facilities.
- It had taken three years to put in the application due to the extensive pre-planning advice taken on board.
- The school already had an overflow car park but access to it was poor and the proposals would improve this issue.
- The proposed materials would match the school building.
- He urged Members to approve the application.

In response to a Member's question, the applicant's representative stated that the school fields were currently used by a children's sports club on Saturday mornings, 10.00am until 1.00pm and up until 10.00pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday evenings.

A Member commented that he was not minded to approve the application due to the concerns raised in relation to car parking issues and the impact it would have on highway safety.

A Member stated that he did not consider car parking to be a substantial objection to the scheme and, due to the benefits the sports facility would have in a District with a substantial obesity problem, expressed strong support for the application.

A number of Members stated their concern about the impact of the floodlighting on local residents. Due to the lack of information on the proposed floodlighting scheme it was suggested that the application be deferred for further information to be provided to the Panel. Clarification was also requested with regard to the type of pitch proposed.

Members raised concerns over the potential disturbance that could be caused to residents living adjacent to the proposed facility, particularly with regard to the use of the floodlighting and noise from the site that could go on until 10.00pm every night.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be deferred for the following reasons:**

- (i) Members seek clarification about the type of synthetic pitch being proposed. Although described as a “3G” pitch on the application form, Sport England have pointed out that it is a sand dressed “AGP” pitch. Members also wanted to know what types of sport would be suitable on the type of synthetic pitch being proposed – is it just suitable for hockey?**
- (ii) Members were not satisfied about lack of detail of floodlighting and want to see more precise lighting detail to be sure that light spill will not adversely affect neighbours. Members were not satisfied with reserving such detail by condition as suggested in the officer report.**
- (iii) Members were not satisfied with the suggested hours of use of the pitch from 8am – 10pm. The implied intention is that sport could be played out on the pitch until 10pm every night with disturbance to neighbours at unsocial hours. The applicant is asked to review and suggest more neighbourly hours.**

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(g) The Sidings, Station Approach,  
Ben Rhydding, Ilkley**

**Ilkley**

Full application for the demolition of an existing dwelling and construction of eight dwellings at The Sidings, Station Approach Ben Rhydding, Ilkley - 18/01342/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the site consisted of two parcels of land (referred to as Areas A and B) and that eight townhouses were proposed (four on each site). An existing bungalow on Area B would be demolished, so the net increase in development would be seven dwellings. The Sidings, which was a large detached house, was located between the two sites. The land was previously owned by British Rail and had been purchased by the applicant. The proposed houses on Area A would be accessed from the un-adopted highway serving Ben Rhydding Station car park. The proposed houses on Area B would be accessed by a short private drive off St John's Road. A public footpath ran adjacent to both sites. The land was unallocated by the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, but was previously developed and was considered to be in a very sustainable location. The proposed houses would be a mix of two and three bedroom homes and the materials would consist of stone and render. Each dwelling would have an integral garage. The application had received 22 representations in objection which included one from a Ward Councillor who had requested that the application be referred to the Area Planning Panel if recommended for approval. The Ward Councillor had raised objection that the access to Area A was via the un-adopted highway to Ben Rhydding Railway Station which emerged into Wheatley Lane near the pinch

point of the railway bridge, however, the Strategic Director considered the width adequate to serve the additional traffic and stated that the additional vehicles that would be using this route would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the traffic system at the bridge. The existing access to Area B was via a 90-degree bend, currently serving the existing bungalow, and it would be widened. Plans had been submitted to demonstrate that vehicles would be able to make turning manoeuvres within the site. Ilkley Parish Council had recommended that the application be refused due to access grounds, extreme over development of the area, poor quality of design and it considered the proposals to be out of keeping with the area. The application was then recommended for approval.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that:

- Adequate visitor car parking spaces would be provided in Area A to ensure visitors did not occupy car parking spaces for station users.
- As the access to Area B would be over an existing footway, it would be modified to accommodate the access and this would also improve the footway for use by pedestrians
- Access to the proposed houses at Area B would be via a short private drive off St John's Road.

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

- There had been continued disagreement in relation to the land for over 20 years.
- He considered the proposal to be overdevelopment.
- The access for Area B would be from a corner which he considered to be dangerous.
- St John's Road was used by patrons of the railway station and children from Ben Rhydding Primary School.
- There was no formal turning head in Area B.
- He considered the estimated increase in traffic in the officer's report to be understated.
- The adjoining highway was already overused and presented poor visibility.
- Access to Area A was via an un-adopted highway to the station which emerged near the pinch point of the railway bridge.
- The area required homes for young people and he did not consider the plans for the proposed dwellings lent themselves to provide to the younger housing market.
- He considered the application proposed a poor scheme and should not be approved due to the inappropriate development and access issues it posed.

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

- The site was located in the centre of Ben Rydding and the proposal would increase the traffic in an already congested area.
- Many users of Ben Rhydding Railway Station parked their cars in the area and parking provision was poor.
- The access to Area B would cut across a footway.
- She considered the application proposed an unacceptable increase in the

- number of houses in the area.
- She urged that if the application was approved, one site be developed at a time.

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

- He had 35 years' experience of working within the Wharfe Valley area as a Planning Consultant and was in attendance to represent a number of local residents.
- He considered the proposal to be against planning policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly with regard to achieving sustainable development and achieving well-designed places.
- He considered that the proposal had failed to demonstrate appropriate layout and access.
- The roads leading off the development were the most traffic congested within Ilkley.
- Developments should function well for the long term which he considered this proposal would fail to do due to its layout.
- The proposal lacked an appropriate relationship with the surrounding street pattern and he considered this to be contrary to policy DS1 (Achieving Good Design) of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

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

- He was representing the views of Ilkley Civic Society.
- The proposal for Area A posed a number of road safety issues.
- Road safety concerns in the area had previously been discussed with the Council and action was promised, including a traffic survey, which residents were still awaiting.
- The officer's report stated that there had been four injury accidents within a 200 metre radius of Ben Rhydding Primary School; there had also been a number of unreported near accidents.

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

- He had lived in the area for a long time and did not wish to spoil it.
- The proposal was more in keeping with the area than the previously withdrawn plans.
- He had taken advice from Local Authority officers to devise a scheme for small, low cost housing in a desirable location which were designed to fit in with the area.
- He had offered to meet with Ilkley Civic Society and Ilkley Parish Council to discuss the proposal but they had both declined.
- The plans included Victorian style street furniture that would enhance an area which bordered onto a Conservation Area.
- There would only be four houses accessed by each entrance.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place stated that the four houses proposed in Area A would be accessed through the station car park and the four houses in Area B would be accessed through the location of the existing bungalow, following its demolition.

In response to issues raised, the Highways officer stated that he did not consider the proposed scheme would generate a level of traffic that could not be accommodated on the local highway and he therefore found the proposal acceptable on highway safety grounds. He added that the National Planning Policy Framework stated that any impact on highway safety would need to be considered severe for the scheme not to be supported on highway grounds. He stated that a formal highways assessment was not required for a scheme containing less than 50 units and was therefore considered unnecessary for this application. During his assessment of Area A, he had estimated that there would be one vehicle movement every 15 minutes. He said consideration had also been given to the fact that the site provided a turning facility and vehicles would therefore not need to reverse onto the highway. The close walking distance to the train station and local primary school were also taken into account.

In response to a Member's question, the Highways officer stated that there was no through route at Area B; refuse collection vehicles were already serving the existing bungalow on the site therefore the number of dwellings that refuse would need to be collected from would be increased by three.

In response to a Member's questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that whilst there would be a degree of disturbance to residents of St John's Road during the construction phase at Area B, the site was large enough for the construction of the dwellings to be contained within the site.

Members made the following comments:

- The access and egress from St John's Road was considered difficult due to the narrow width of the junction and the number of parked vehicles on the roadside; this would be exacerbated with additional houses at Area B.
- The car parking proposal at Area A was considered inadequate.
- The proposal was considered detrimental to pedestrian safety, particularly as the footpath was used by children travelling to and from Ben Rhydding Primary School.
- The proposal was considered overdevelopment of the site.
- The proposal could cause difficulties for emergency vehicle access.
- More consideration was needed with regard to the layout and number of houses proposed.
- The scheme proposed a high density which was considered unacceptable for the site.
- Concern was raised with regard to access for construction vehicles through the station car park and access for refuse collection vehicles for the additional houses.
- If the application was approved, one site should be constructed at a time.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be refused for the following reason:**

**The number of dwellings proposed is of excessive density given the constraints of the two accesses to Areas A and B, the restricted space for**

turning and bin collection and reliance on accesses across the station car park and conflicting with users of the footway in St John's Road.

*Action: Strategic Director, Place*

17. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(a) 1 Wharf Street, Shipley Shipley

Unauthorised extension (garage) - 17/00260/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) under delegated powers authorised the issuing of an enforcement notice on 20 June 2018.

(b) Land at Bank End Farm, Bank Lane, Silsden Craven

Mixed use of land consisting agriculture and use of land as a contractor's depot for a plant hire, waste carrier, construction, groundworks, landscaping and haulage contractor - 17/00847/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, 20 June 2018.

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

*APPEALS ALLOWED*

(c) 18 Mornington Street, Keighley Keighley Central

Change of use of ground floor from C3 dwelling to A2 estate agent's office (upper floors to remain as a dwelling) - Case No: 17/05853/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00006/APPFL2

(d) 23 Springfield Road, Baildon Baildon

Construction of new dwelling on vacant garden plot - Case No: 17/05001/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00022/APPFL2

(e) 5 Long Meadows, Burley In Wharfedale Wharfedale

Replace existing fence - Case No: 17/06242/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00015/APPHOU

(f) Holly House, Spring Gardens Lane, Keighley Keighley Central

Change of use from Class B1 offices to a registered nursery - Case No:  
17/03315/PVS

Appeal Ref: 17/00135/APPPVS

**APPEALS DISMISSED**

**(g) 31 Otley Road, Eldwick, Bingley** **Bingley**

Construction of detached dwelling (revised scheme to 17/01311/FUL) - Case No:  
17/04848/FUL

Appeal Ref: 17/00134/APPFL2

**(h) 39 Aire View Avenue, Cottingley, Bingley** **Bingley Rural**

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 15/00951/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 18/00010/APPENF

**(i) 9 Broadwell Drive, Bradford** **Windhill And Wrose**

Construction of detached store and games room - Case No: 17/05868/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00016/APPHOU

**(j) Foreside Mill, Halifax Road, Denholme** **Bingley Rural**

Erection of 42 affordable dwellings - Case No: 17/05256/MAF

Appeal Ref: 18/00024/APPFL2

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

Chair

**Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley).**

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