

## Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 12 December 2018 at 10.00 am in the Council Chamber - Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 10.00 am  
Concluded 11.25 am

### Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	THE INDEPENDENTS
Rickard Riaz	Lee Abid Hussain Godwin Mullaney	Naylor

Observer: Councillor Rebecca Whitaker (Minute 34(b))

### Councillor Lee in the Chair

#### 30. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Naylor disclosed an interest in relation to the Airedale General Hospital, Skipton Road, Steeton with Eastburn application (Minute 34(a)) as he was a member of Silsden Town Council and had been involved in developing the Silsden Neighbourhood Plan. He therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of the 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 Godwin disclosed that he was currently employed by Airedale NHS Foundation Trust in relation to the Airedale General Hospital, Skipton Road, Steeton with Eastburn application (Minute 34(a)). He therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of the 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).

**Action: City Solicitor**

**31. MINUTES**

**Resolved –**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2018 be signed as a correct record.**

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

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

**33. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

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

**(a) Airedale General Hospital, Skipton Road, Craven  
Steeton with Eastburn**

Full application for the construction of car parking with associated infrastructure at Airedale General Hospital, Skipton Road, Steeton with Eastburn - 18/03920/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that Airedale Hospital was a major employer in the area and the site comprised of land within its complex. He stated that the site had previously been occupied by buildings for staff accommodation/offices but, following a recent site visit, he confirmed that all of these buildings had been demolished and the site was now a roughly surfaced area being used for car parking. He stated that the application, for 314 car parking spaces specifically for hospital staff, had been submitted to alleviate pressures on car parking for staff and visitors to the hospital and that the current shortage of car parking spaces was leading to indiscriminate parking taking place on grass verges and double yellow lines in the area. The application included electric vehicle charging points and an acceptable surface water drainage plan. He reported that there had only been one objection to the proposal from Steeton and Eastburn Parish Council stating that the proposal was contrary to Policy SWES 9 and Objective 8 of the Steeton, Eastburn and Silsden Neighbourhood Plan in terms of the effect on parking, traffic and road safety and the noise and general disturbance to adjoining properties. The Parish Council also made reference to details of their Neighbourhood Plan which stated that they wanted parking charges to be abolished at Airedale General Hospital and resident only parking to be introduced in Steeton with Eastburn. The Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Area Planning Panel. With regard to the concerns raised by the Parish Council, he stated that he did not consider the proposal would create noise and disturbance as there were no near neighbours that would be directly affected by the additional car parking and the adjoining land to the site was open countryside to the north and was located

within the confines of the existing site next to the circulation road. The applicant had responded to the Parish Council's concern about parking, traffic and road safety stating that the additional car parking was essential to provide extra parking infrastructure on the site, to formalise the existing parking on the poorly surfaced area and to meet the demand for parking for existing staff numbers. He stated that although the emerging Neighbourhood Plan was a material consideration, only limited weight could be given to it because it had not been adopted. The application was then recommended for approval.

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

- Indiscriminate parking was taking place around the hospital site.
- Visitors to the hospital were parking on residential streets to avoid paying the car parking charges on the hospital's site which was causing access problems, particularly for ambulances.
- Residents were having difficulties driving up and down their roads due to blockages being caused by parked cars.
- The Executive were in the process of considering the policy covering off-street parking and if permit parking was implemented in Steeton with Eastburn, the objection in relation to this would be removed.
- If the proposal was approved, it would be at a cost to residents therefore she considered the hospital should fund parking permits for residents through a Section 106 agreement.
- Residents were fed up with the indiscriminate parking caused by staff and visitors of the hospital.

The Chair stated that it was not within the Panel's remit to insist that anyone pay for resident parking permits.

In response to Members' questions, it was reported that:

- The proposed car park would provide an additional 314 car parking spaces for hospital staff.
- The Panel were only considering the application which proposed to use the land on the site as a car park to address the existing problems.
- Approximately 130 cars could park on the site at present.

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

- The hospital was getting busier each year with an average yearly growth of 4% in A&E admissions.
- It was essential for staff and visitors to have car parking available to them to get to work/appointments on time.
- Airedale General Hospital was the largest local employer.
- The Parish Council has raised concerns of road safety but the current situation created road safety issues due to people parking on grass verges and double yellow lines.
- The proposal would create less noise and disturbance as the car park would be newly tarmacked.
- The site was currently a fall, trip and slip hazard due to its uneven surface.

- The Trust had consulted local residents who were happy with the proposal.
- It was not appropriate for a Section 106 agreement to be imposed on the applicant in relation to the proposal as it would not increase traffic, it would in effect alleviate it.

Members made the following comments:

- There had been no objections received from local residents against the proposal.
- The proposal would alleviate car parking issues currently affecting local residents.
- Although sympathising with the points made by the Parish Council, it seemed logical to introduce additional staff car parking on the hospital site to alleviate the current car parking issues.

**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) Land at Redcar Farm, Redcar Lane,  
Steeton with Eastburn**

**Craven**

Full application for two polytunnel buildings for the accommodation of sheep at Land at Redcar Farm, Redcar Lane, Steeton with Eastburn - 18/04099/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the site was located in open Green Belt countryside and off an existing access track from Redcar Lane; the land was part of a farm holding in a rural upland landscape; the land comprised of open pasture fields surrounded by dry-stone walls that sloped down towards the corner of the field where the polytunnels were proposed to be located; the application sought permission to place two polytunnel buildings in the corner of a field off Redcar Lane; whilst most other buildings were inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the National Planning Policy Framework continued to regard buildings for the purposes of agriculture as an exception to that policy; saved policy GB1 of the RUDP also allowed for agricultural buildings in the Green Belt; the two polytunnels were rectangular in shape and each measured 8.5 metres x 14 metres and 3.25 metres in height; and the applicant’s agent had stated that the polytunnels would contain pens through which ewes would progress as they reached different stages of lambing. He explained that the same polytunnel buildings were presently standing on the same land holding but in a different position and that the applicant had stated that he had not been aware that there was a restricted covenant placed on that piece of land which had necessitated removal to a new position unaffected by that covenant; the application therefore sought to relocate the existing buildings to a new position on the land. The applicant had also explained that the land holding at Redcar Farm was tenanted. The Strategic Director, Place stated that four objections had been received against the proposal and a Ward Councillor had also objected and requested

referral of the application to the Area Planning Panel. Objectors had complained about scrap metal and bales of hay being stored on the site causing an eye sore in the Green Belt and about other unauthorised uses of the land taking place such as sales of hay and large vehicles visiting the site causing damage and disturbance to neighbouring properties. Concerns were raised that if the polytunnels were relocated these problems would continue, causing further nuisance to neighbouring farms. Concerns had also been raised in relation to the approval of the application for the existing polytunnels, due to the restrictive covenants on the land, but it was reported that this decision had been taken in line with planning regulations, under delegated powers by officers. He stated that there was clearly an agricultural need for the polytunnels and therefore the application was acceptable when considered against Green Belt policy. He reported the receipt of additional comments from a neighbouring resident which had reiterated previous concerns that had been raised about disturbance and additional traffic, however, the Strategic Director, Place considered that concerns relating to land management, disturbance from traffic and the covenants on the land were not material planning considerations. He informed Members that an Enforcement Officer had recently visited the site and had found no reason to undertake enforcement action. Whilst surplus hay had been sold from the site during the summer, this had not breached any planning controls. He stated that the previous application for the existing polytunnels had contained a condition that the polytunnels be removed if they were no longer required and that this condition was proposed for this application too. He found no reason to refuse the relocation of the two polytunnels and therefore recommended the application for approval.

A discussion took place, following a query from a Ward Councillor in attendance at the meeting, in relation to photographs she had submitted to the Planning Officer showing materials stored on the site. It was clarified that the photographs had been submitted with the Councillor's objection and were not included in the Strategic Director's presentation. The Chair stated that up to four photographs can be submitted to the Panel but they have to be sent to Committee Secretariat at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. She also stated that the Panel were only considering the application for two polytunnel buildings.

The Ward Councillor went on to make the following points:

- She was representing a neighbouring resident to the site and whilst the covenant was not a planning consideration, the current situation had been greatly detrimental for the neighbouring resident and her family.
- She had visited the site prior to the Planning Officer's visit and had seen materials being stored on the site which were unrelated to farming activity and considered them to be an eyesore.
- The polytunnels were temporary buildings and therefore should not need a hard standing.
- She did not believe that the Planning Officer's unannounced visit was unannounced as the site had been cleared, of materials that should not have been on the site in the first instance, by the applicant and his family just before the visit took place.
- The applicant had carried out numerous fires on the site which was not conducive when there were animals on the neighbouring farms.
- Residents and neighbours had been disturbed by vehicles accessing the site

- during the night as light from vehicles shone through their windows.
- Residents had a right to residential amenity.
  - The applicant had stated that they had sold hay on-line, which had led to a number of vehicles accessing the site for collections.
  - The neighbouring resident's fence had been damaged by vehicles accessing the site.
  - The existing polytunnels were an unsightly blot on the landscape and were visible for miles around.
  - She urged the Panel to refuse the application or, if they were minded to approve it, attach a number of conditions to: restrict activity on the site to agricultural farming use only; prevent a house from being built on the site in the future; prevent scrap metal, plastic and animal carcasses being stored on the site (and ensure animal carcasses are disposed of appropriately); and give consideration to neighbouring residents.

In response to a Member's questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that a condition could be added to ensure the demolition of the existing two polytunnels. He also reported that the closest neighbouring resident lived a couple hundred metres away from the site.

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

- It was accepted that ewes and lambs required shelter.
- Whilst restrictive covenants were not planning matters, planning permission could not override them.
- He urged the Panel to ensure that the existing access would be used rather than the creation of a new access through the dry stone wall.
- The site was in effect a farm yard and the farm yard should be re-located too, to promote animal welfare and protect the green belt.
- He considered that condition two of the original application from 2017 should be replicated for this new 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 also subject to the following additional conditions:**

- (i) Upon commencement of the construction of the two polytunnels hereby approved, the existing two polytunnels, including the hard standings and all associated developments, shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition.**
- (ii) The existing dry stone walls adjoining the site shall be retained and no new field accesses shall be formed.**

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

**(c) Peaselands, Westcliffe Road, Shipley**

**Shipley**

Full application for the conversion of existing ancillary day centre, together with single-storey extension and additional bay windows, to provide seven additional affordable retirement units and associated alterations to car parking and landscaping plus new kitchen extraction flue at Peaselands, Westcliffe Road, Shipley - 18/03126/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that Peaselands was a sheltered housing complex run by Anchor Housing Trust which provided housing for the elderly. It was located on the north side of Westcliffe Road on the edge of Shipley Town Centre, close to an Asda supermarket. The day centre had previously been used for a number of clubs and activities to take place and the proposal was to convert this to seven additional flats. A number of minor alterations were proposed, to which there were no planning objections, however, 47 objections and several petitions had been received against the development about the loss of the accommodation from clubs that had used it. The Shipley MP and a Ward Councillor had also written in to give support to their affected constituents. Anchor Housing Trust had responded to the concerns raised, outlining that the decision had not been taken lightly and was due to the financial viability of the day centre as it was under-used and they could no longer continue to subsidise the costs of running the day centre plus the costs of repair and general maintenance of the building. The applicant considered the best alternative use for the building would be to create additional sheltered housing units compatible with the existing residential complex. The letter also outlined steps that the applicant was taking to identify other meeting spaces available within the Shipley area that could accommodate the displaced groups/clubs that had previously used the day centre, in order to offset the loss of the service currently offered by the Anchorage. He stated that the application did not contravene the National Planning Policy Framework and had put forward a convincing argument for the proposal. The application was then recommended for approval.

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

- She was employed by Anchor Housing Trust and was responsible for its housing stock in Shipley.
- She acknowledged that the day centre was a valuable resource to its users.
- The day centre was unused most of the time and Anchor Housing Trust had been running the facility at a loss.
- Anchor Housing Trust could no longer continue to incur financial losses on the day centre every year and had not taken the decision lightly.
- The safety and security of the residents was the applicant's priority.
- Anchor Housing Trust was currently supporting third party groups to find alternative venues for their activities.
- The applicant planned to re-model a lounge and kitchen area in order to continue to provide lunches.
- The proposal for seven flats would provide additional affordable housing to rent for older people within the complex.

A Member commended the applicant for engaging with the groups and clubs in

order to find them alternative accommodation.

**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***

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

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

A representative of The Holy Family Catholic School was in attendance at the meeting and, in response to a question from the Chair, stated that the school had not consulted with local residents about its proposal. Members considered that the item should be deferred in order for the school to carry out a public consultation and that the outcome of that should be reported back to the Panel.

An objector who had submitted a number of questions to the Strategic Director, Place agreed for those questions to be passed to the applicant in order for them to respond accordingly.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be deferred until the Panel’s meeting on 27 February 2019 in order for the applicant to undertake a public consultation with local residents.**

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

**35. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

**REQUEST FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION**

**(a) 3 Oakdale Avenue, Wrose, Shipley Windhill & Wrose**

Breach of condition 2 of planning permission 12/04160/HOU - 18/00878/ENFCO

On 12 October 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Breach of Condition Notice.

## DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

### **APPEAL ALLOWED**

- (b) **Wood Mill Farm, Wood Mill Lane, Laycock, Keighley** **Keighley West**

Change of use of a chalet style cabin situated in the garden of the property to all year round holiday let accommodation - Case No: 18/01564/CLP

Appeal Ref: 18/00067/APPCLP

### **APPEALS DISMISSED**

- (c) **1 Priestthorpe Hall, Park Road, Bingley** **Bingley**

Detached glazed outbuilding (retrospective) - Case No: 18/01253/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00091/APPFL2

- (d) **18 Rhodes Street, Saltaire, Shipley** **Shipley**

Retrospective planning application for the removal of unsafe concrete wall at the front and the side with property number 20 and replace with timber fence panels/posts and gate. - Case No: 18/01144/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00077/APPHOU

- (e) **21 Easby Close, Ilkley** **Ilkley**

Two-storey extension to side and rear with single storey extension to rear - Case No: 18/00543/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00078/APPHOU

- (f) **22 Rycroft Avenue, Cottingley, Bingley** **Bingley Rural**

Porch to front, two-storey extension to side and rear and hip to gable roof extension with dormer windows to front and rear - Case No: 18/01809/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00076/APPHOU

- (g) **Anley Clarence Drive, Menston, Ilkley** **Ilkley**

Construction of detached dwelling and garage - Case No: 17/06251/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00079/APPFL2

- (h) **Land at Hag Farm Road, Sandholme Drive, Burley in Wharfedale, Ilkley** **Wharfedale**

Outline application for two dwellings - Case No: 17/04724/OUT

Appeal Ref: 18/00058/APPOU2

(i) **Pennywell, 19 Hunters Green, Cullingworth, Bingley** **Bingley Rural**

Demolish and replace existing gable end porch - Case No: 18/01410/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00094/APPFL2

(j) **Unit B, 194-196 Saltaire Road, Shipley** **Shipley**

Change of use from off licence/convenience store to micro pub serving alcohol - Case No: 18/00780/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00085/APPFL2

**APPEAL ALLOWED IN PART/PART DISMISSED**

(k) **Land at 5 Whiddon Croft, Menston, Ilkley** **Wharfedale**

Submission of details to comply with conditions 3, 4, 8, 12 and part of condition 7(4), of permission 15/01204/FUL dated 16.02.16: Construction of a single detached dwelling - Case No: 15/01204/SUB01

Appeal Ref: 18/00039/APPNO2

**Resolved –**

**That the decisions be noted.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

### **36. CHAIR'S CLOSING REMARKS**

The Chair stated that at a previous meeting of the Panel she had made comments in relation to a Member who had referred items to the Panel but had not attended the meeting to explain his reasons for doing so. She stated that Cllr Kevin Warnes had contacted her after the meeting as he considered her comment to be inappropriate. She therefore apologised to Cllr Kevin Warnes for the comment but maintained that it would be courteous for the Panel to be informed as to the reason why a Ward Councillor who had referred an item could not attend the meeting and the reasons for the referral.

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