

## Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 26 February 2020 in Council Chamber - Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 10.05 am  
Concluded 1.20 pm

### Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	THE INDEPENDENTS
Engel Abid Hussain Godwin Mullaney	Barker K Green	Naylor

Observer  
:  
Councillor

Lintern for Minute 40(g)

### Councillor Engel in the Chair

#### 36. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

- (a) In the interest of transparency Councillor Godwin disclosed an interest in Minute 6(g) as the application was within his Ward, however, he had not disclosed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties.
- (b) In the interest of transparency Councillor Kyle Green disclosed an interest in Minute 6(f) as the application was within his Ward, however, he had not disclosed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties.

Action: City Solicitor

#### 37. MINUTES

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2019 be signed as a correct record.

#### 38. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

**39. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

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

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

**(a) 78 Westfield Lane, Shipley Windhill and Wrose**

Demolition of existing detached dwelling and construction of 5 detached houses at 78 Westfield Lane, Wrose, Shipley – 19/04644/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that this previously developed site comprised a largish plot, (0.17 hectares) currently occupied by a two-storey stone-built house (No 78) which was set centrally within the land in an elevated position fronting Westfield Lane. The garden areas that surrounded the house had largely been cleared of vegetation. Stone outbuildings were sited to the northern corner against the boundaries with some neighbouring residential properties. A private access track existed between the western side of the land and No 74 Westfield Lane. This lead up to a disused reservoir site and was understood to have been a maintenance access for Yorkshire Water. A drive access to the house was currently provided between gate piers in the south east corner. Stone walls defined the boundaries to the north east and north-west edges of the site. Levels rose up from Westfield Lane towards the rear of the site. The area was residential in character with a mix of property types and styles. A relatively recent infill, detached dwelling lay to the south west. Semi-detached, two storey properties were sited to the south-east and the north-west, with dormer bungalows across Westfield Lane.

It was reported that letters/emails had been received by 10 individuals in objection and 14 in support on the application. The objectors concerns included that the proposal would be overdevelopment of the site; the proposed dwellings were too close to site boundaries and would lead to a loss of light for neighbouring property; the proposed dwellings would overlook neighbouring property; the proposal would lead to an increase in traffic and on street parking that would exacerbate existing problems on Westfield Lane; a number of trees had been removed from the site; construction traffic would cause problems with the surrounding road network; the proposal would cause problems for the local drainage network; the existing house was a local landmark and should not be demolished.

Members were informed that the comments in support of the proposal included that the proposal would deliver new family homes into the area and contribute to

the local community; the current house on the site was out dated and out of character with surrounding more modern properties; the proposal would make more efficient use of a large site and deliver more family homes; the proposal would remove an outdated, derelict house and outbuildings.

It was reported that recommendation 4 of the conditions of approval needed to be amended to state that the development shall not be occupied until details of a scheme for separate foul and surface water drainage, including any existing sewers, culverts, land drains and any balancing works or off-site works had been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details. This would ensure proper drainage of the site to accord with policy EN7 of the Core Strategy.

Members felt that an additional condition should be attached which required that all hardstandings within the development had a permeable surface to reduce surface water run-off from the site.

The Agent for the applicant attended the meeting and spoke in support of the proposal he reported that the property was tired and needed a lot of work; the proposal would provide excellent family accommodation; Yorkshire Water no longer required access to the disused reservoir site; the access track was privately owned and the applicant had agreement to use the track as part of the development and that the gates would be removed.

Members were informed that the proposal was not considered harmful to the visual amenity, residential amenity or highway safety and was therefore considered to comply with the aforementioned policies of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **Resolved-**

- (1) That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report subject to Condition 4 being amended as follows:**

**The development shall not be occupied until details of a scheme for separate foul and surface water drainage, including any existing sewers, culverts, land drains and any balancing works or off-site works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To ensure proper drainage of the site to accord with policy EN7 of the Core Strategy.**

- (2) That an additional condition be added to require that all hardstandings within the development have a permeable surface.**

**Reason: To reduce surface water run-off from the site.**

- (3) That the precise wording of the above resolution be delegated to the Assistant Director, Transportation, Design and Planning.**

**Reason:**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

- (b) Florence House, Lawkholme Lane Business Park, Keighley** **Keighley Central**

Full application for change of use of part of an adopted highway to private curtilage including installation of palisade fencing and electric gates. Florence House, Lawkholme Lane Business Park Keighley – 19/04275/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that the site was in the Lawkholme area north of Keighley town centre. It was in an industrial estate comprising modern sheds and some older stone workshop buildings. It was bounded by Lawkholme Lane and the Airedale railway line. The site access from Lawkholme Lane was an adopted road called Spearhead Way. Various car repair and tyre sales businesses occupied the units along the northern side of Spearhead Way. The applicant was a construction contractor's business which operated from units located in the southern portion of the estate. A gated entrance to their compound was currently located at the closure point of the southern spur of Spearhead Way. The applicant's land was a compound defined by 2.5 metre high galvanised steel palisade fences.

Members were informed that the application sought to change the use of the end portion of the southern leg of the adopted Spearhead Way. This was a length of 24 metres. The proposal was to enclose this portion of the highway and bring it within the adjoining curtilage by simply repositioning the existing palisade fencing and security gates 24 metres further northwards. The applicant owned the land beneath the highway. The applicant had said that the motivation for the proposal was that, following the acquisition of Unit 1, the business wanted to create a combined compound which would improve its logistics and efficiency and increase the amount of secure parking for its local workforce. Re-positioning the access was necessary to achieve this aim.

It was reported that letters/emails in objection had been received from 13 individuals in connection with the application. The objectors concerns included the proposed gates would limit movement of traffic for neighbouring businesses, delivery lorries would not be able to turn and would need to reverse out onto Lawkholme Lane.

Highway safety concerns and the proposal would lead to loss of parking in Spearhead Way.

In response to a Members question it was reported that Highways had no objections in principal to the proposal. The applicant had now demonstrated that sufficient highway would remain to allow articulated vehicles to turn around.

A Keighley Town Councillor attended the meeting and stated that Keighley Town Council supported 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.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(c) Land at Bolton Road, Silsden**

**Craven**

Full application for the construction of bungalow and car space and new Bitmac surfacing and drainage to parts of unadopted back and side streets at land behind Bolton Road, Silsden – 19/05189/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that the site was a small 0.02 hectares garden area associated with the end terrace house dwelling at 81 Bolton Road. The land was separated from the back yard of the dwelling by an unsurfaced access serving the back of the terrace. Another similar plot of land existed to the north. A hedge ran along the southern frontage of the land and another modern bungalow was visible beyond the site and standing at a higher level. Access to the site was from either Bolton Road via a poorly surface unadopted access from the south of Townhead from the north. The surrounding area was mainly residential.

It was reported that a total of seven letters of objection had been received. An objection has also been received from Silsden Town Council whose objections included over development of a plot on an unadopted road; drainage issues in this area; concerns for displacement parking particularly holistically as Skipton Properties due to develop 62 houses at Tannery corner.

Members were informed that the seven objections received from local residents included:

- Surrounding area had been subject to infilling in recent years and further development was planned. Local housing requirements had been met.
- Surface water was a concern and back Bolton Road had been damaged by severe rain.
- There was a culverted watercourse under or close to back Bolton Road which could be damaged by the development.
- Traffic was a concern for the area, including several incidents and a serious accident of Bolton Road.
- A new garage had been built on back Bolton Road that restricted the space to manoeuvre from the site.

- Access to the site was over third party land.
- The proposed road surfacing was inadequate.
- The proposed exit point from the site was onto a blind corner.
- There was a query over land ownership.
- Owls and bats had been seen in the area and should not be disturbed by the development.
- Back Bolton Road was frequently obstructed by parked cars.
- Sewerage in Silsden was already inadequate.
- The proposed leyandii hedge would block light.
- The site had always been a garden and would appear cramped with a bungalow on it.

Members were informed that this application was similar to a previously approved application which was supported by Highways subject to conditions. There were no highway objections to raise about the proposed development subject to highway conditions to secure provision of car parking and the improvement of the access roads leading to the site.

It was reported that Yorkshire Water had been consulted and had not raised any objections. The response from Yorkshire Water was received after the report had been published.

Members raised concern about the lack of space at the rear of the terrace for vehicular access to the property; concerned about the turning point to gain access in and out of the property; needed to look at other options such as removing some of the hedge to accommodate better access in and out of the property. It was reported that the unmade access track at the rear of the property was unadopted.

An objector attended the meeting and raised the following concerns:

- There was a 30 foot birch tree – the site plans were not accurate.
- The culverted watercourse under or close to Back Bolton Road could be damaged by development.
- The development would encroach onto no 87; there were discrepancies around all four boundaries.
- Access to the site was a great concern; corner of Bolton Back Lane was too narrow; the proposals would cause problems for no 89 who needed the access free in case of an emergency due to their family circumstances and would not be appropriate to restrict that access.
- Silsden Town Council was also now objecting to the drainage issues in the area.
- Parking was a major concern.

In response to the objections raised the Planning Officer reported that:

- He was not aware of the discrepancy in relation to the boundary of the property.
- The beech tree would not be affected by the proposed development.
- In terms of the culverted watercourse Yorkshire Water had not objected to the proposal.

- The proposed application had been previously granted.
- The Silsden Town Council objections were different to the ones made previously.

The applicants planning consultant spoke in support of the application and stated that the applicants were not aware of the location of the culverted watercourse but Yorkshire Water had no objections in terms of drainage; the proposal had not changed since it was last submitted and approved in 2015; parking issues were a private matter between parties and agreed with the comments made by the Planning Officer in response to the objections.

Members raised concern about the impact on the culverted watercourse and its location.

### **Resolved-**

**That the application be deferred for further investigation to establish the position and extent of culverts or watercourses under or near the site, and to require amendments to the parking space layout.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(d) 12 Telford Close, Silsden**

**Craven**

Outline application for residential development of one detached dwelling requesting consideration of access, appearance and landscaping at 12 Telford Close Silsden – 19/04921/OUT.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that the site formed the side garden to 12 Telford Close which was a detached bungalow at the end of a cul de sac street in a residential area of similar properties. The land slopes upwards towards the end of the cul de sac and the two dwellings at the top (12 and 14) were single storey bungalows. The other dwellings on the cul de sac were two storey dwellings in the dormer bungalow style. Behind the site were other gardens of properties on Waterside.

It was reported that an outline application for residential development of detached dwelling requesting consideration of access and landscaping was refused on 16 September 2019. The refusal was presently the subject of a Planning Inspectorate Appeal.

Members were informed the reasons for the previous refusal were detailed in the report.

It was reported that 11 representations received objecting to the development from residents of Telford Close and Waterside and included that:

- The proposed dwelling, at 53 sqm was too small and below Bradford's current building standard.
- The development would increase traffic congestion on Telford Close.
- The access and egress from the site would be unsafe.

- Disruption to Telford Close during the construction.
- The proposed dwelling would sit in a cramped site and be contrary to the existing pattern of development which was characterised by openness.
- The location of the site boundary was queried.
- There were historic drainage issues and this development would make them worse.
- There was other residential development underway in Silsden that were more appropriate.

It was reported that there had been 9 representations received in support of the development which included that:

- A small bungalow in the garden would have little impact on the surrounding both visually and in terms of increased vehicular movement.
- The proposed dwelling would be in keeping with the other dwellings on Telford Close.
- There was adequate space to accommodate the development.
- A small development like this should be encouraged.
- The dwelling would suit a retired couple or disabled person.
- The development would not be detrimental to highway safety.
- There had been extensions on Telford Close in the past.
- Telford Close did not suffer from traffic congestion.
- This would help to achieve the aim to “promote efficiency in land usage” to meet housing needs which was one of Bradford Council’s aims.
- The site was close to a bus route.

Members were informed that Silsden Town Council objections included that the development was overbearing for the area as the site was not large enough for a detached dwelling and did not comply with Bradford’s adopted Core Strategy, similarly the Town Council believed that there was insufficient space for the movement and parking for the number of vehicles identified and therefore did not comply with Bradford’s adopted core strategy.

Members sought clarification on whether the proposal would encroach onto the neighbouring property.

It was reported that the proposed additional development would be out of keeping with the existing pattern of development and would result in a cramped and over dominant feature. The lack of space within the site would result in a poorly configured access and parking arrangement that would not be convenient or practical to use. It would raise potential for conflicts between users of the site due to the need to reverse long distances down the shared driveway onto the turning head on Telford Close with potentially poor visibility from the dividing wall. The proposal would be detrimental to highway safety.

The applicant attended the meeting and spoke in support of the application and expressed her disappointment at the planning portal not being available from December to January to be able to demonstrate the scale and layout of the Plan; the Highways Section did not comment on the first application and that application was not refused on highway grounds; there was a dropped kerb already in place; it was a large site and easy to drive in and out of; there were no highway safety issues; the proposal contributed to sustainable development; the planning case

officer had made several mistakes ; did the planning case officer know where the property was and that the land belonged to us and that the boundary had been discussed with neighbours?

Members were informed that the reasons for the previous refusal were listed on pages 28 and 29 of the agenda which included poorly configured access and parking arrangements.

It was reported that Highways had concerns regarding access to the parking space proposed fronting the existing dwelling. Drivers reversing out of this space onto the shared drive would be likely to experience visibility difficulties. The existing dwelling would obstruct visibility of other vehicles reversing out of the shared driveway. crossings adjacent to one another.

There was a short discussion on the access, parking arrangements and the suitability of the proposed development and its impact on neighbouring properties.

**Resolved-**

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

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(e) 2 Mayfield Drive, Sandbeds, Keighley**

**Keighley East**

Householder application for the construction of two-storey extensions to the side and rear of 2, Mayfield Drive, Sandbeds, Keighley - 19/04154/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that the site was one of a pair of matching and symmetrically designed semi-detached dwellings on this cul de sac off the main Bradford Road. It was faced in white render with a dark brown concrete tiled roof. A gable projecting across part of the roof at the front was a strong design feature of the matching pair of houses. Mayfield Drive was a short residential cul de sac with a mix of types of semi-detached houses lining the street. The street rose steeply up from Bradford Road so the application house was elevated above the level of the rear elevations of the houses to the south fronting Bradford Road. There was an intervening flat roofed garage, and a small single storey extension to the rear. Behind the application dwelling was a pair of bungalows on Airedale Mount. It was reported that one objection letter had been received. A petition of support had been received requesting the application be referred to the Area Planning Panel for determination in the event of an officer recommendation to refuse.

It was reported that the summary of the objection was that the proposed extensions to the side and rear of the house were very large, doubling the size of

the existing house. The moving of the rear wall closer to the objectors property, with two large gables, with windows, at first floor level, would have a large visual impact when viewed from the objectors bungalow and would be intrusive; the floor levels in the side extension were somewhat higher than the existing floors at both ground and first floor so would give a greater feeling of being overlooked in the objectors property.

Photographs provided by the applicant were circulated to Members which showed similar extensions that had been constructed in the area.

The comments in support stated that the extension had been designed to achieve separation at the rear in accordance with Householder Design Guidance.

It was reported that amended plans had been received following an officer request to reduce the scale of the proposed extensions. However, these plans did not sufficiently reduce the scale of the extensions to accord with design guidance and so reduce the harmful impact on neighbouring dwellings to enable a recommendation for approval.

In response to Members questions it was reported that the rear garden of 1 Airedale Mount was only 6 metres in depth. Therefore the proposed windows would have views at very close quarters (13.75 metres). The two storey rear extension would cause unreasonable overlooking due to the lack of separation. Being so close and significantly higher than the neighbouring bungalow, it would affect the neighbours' privacy and outlook to an unacceptable degree.

It was reported that the proposed rear extension would not comply with the "45 degree" guideline in relation to the nearest first floor window in the rear of the adjoining semi at of 4 Mayfield Drive. The Householder SPD guidance says that to avoid loss of light, extensions should not impinge on a line drawn at 45 degrees from the nearest window in the adjoining house.

A Keighley Town Councillor stated that Keighley Town Council did not support the proposal due to its overbearing impact and loss of privacy on neighbouring property.

The applicant attended the meeting and spoke on the reasons for the extension and that she had not received sufficient support from the planning case officer in assisting her to put forward a scheme that would be considered reasonable and that she had not been able to contact the planning case officer or her architect. At this point the applicant decided to withdraw the application.

#### **Resolved-**

**That the application be withdrawn at the request of the applicant.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(f) 74 Wheatley Lane, Ilkley**

**Ilkley**

A planning application for the demolition of an existing garage and construction of a new two storey garage to house three vehicles and form a one bedroomed annexe on the first floor at 74 Wheatley Lane, Ilkley - 19/01115/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that the site was a large detached property constructed primarily with a rendered finish but with sections of natural stone with a green coloured tile to the roof dating from the 1930s. The property was set in a large plot and does not appear as a prominent feature within the wider streetscene. Access to the property was achieved off a private drive from the highway Wheatley Lane which also served a number of neighbouring properties. To the front of the property was a detached pre-fabricated single garage. There were a number of trees on and around the site which were protected by way of a Tree Preservation Order.

Members were informed that Ilkley Town Council had recommended refusal of this application due to concerns for the removal of the trees, the proposed oversize of the garage and the potential use of the extra accommodation in the garage.

It was reported that 14 letters of support had been received and one raising general comments and one objection to the proposal had been received as follows:

- Ilkley Civic Society objected to the application since the proposed development would require major removals/tree surgery to fit the new garage plus annexe under the tree canopy and consequent root damage. They also considered that the proposed structure represented an overdevelopment of the site due to its height and massing.
- An adjacent neighbour had made a number of general points on the proposal as follows:-

The proposed drawings were confusing as they included a previously approved scheme from 2017 which was not yet built.

The neighbour at No 80 also commented that they did not receive notification of an earlier planning application and suggested that all notification letters should be sent out by recorded delivery.

Objected to any work which to a cotoneaster tree T11 on their property as this tree was valued in its own right and also for its potential screening benefits. Other trees on this neighbouring property were not clearly shown on the submitted drawings.

No objection to the removal of a number of other trees, notably T4, T9 and T10. The neighbour also wished to be notified well in advance of dates on which access to their property was required.

It was reported that representations had been received from various parts of the District and beyond making the following points:-

- The two storey garage would be of great benefit to the property. The existing pre-fabricated garage was an eyesore and its replacement would be welcomed.
- The extension would not interfere with the existing surroundings. The garage would be preferable to extending the dwelling as approved under 2017.
- This proposal would greatly improve the appearance of the area.

Members were informed that the Trees Team objected to the proposal due to the level of engineering required for this extension which would likely be extensive and have a materially adverse impact on the protected woodland edge trees and trees, jeopardise their retention and likely lead to their loss or damage.

In response to a Members question in relation to the health of the trees it was reported that the trees were mostly fair or in a good condition.

The applicants agent attended the meeting and spoke in support of the application he reported that the proposed structure would not impact on the tree routes; the applicants tree consultant confirmed the development would not cause any harm to the trees; the foundation of the proposed development would be of a high quality which would not harm the tree roots and the proposed structure would not affect tree pruning.

In response to the Agents comments it was reported that the excavation holes did show some sign of damage to the tree roots.

Members suggested to the applicants agent whether the applicant could consider moving the proposed development so that it did not cause any impact to the protected trees.

At this point the applicants agent decided to withdraw the application

**Resolved-**

**That the application be withdrawn at the request of the applicant.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(g) Former 51 Broster Avenue, Keighley**

**Keighley West**

Full planning application for the construction of two x two-bedroom flats above existing single storey convenience store at 51 Broster Avenue Keighley - 19/04900/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and

informed Members that the site was in a residential estate in west Keighley, at the corner of Broster Avenue and Braithwaite Avenue, alongside a roundabout junction. It was occupied by a convenience store which was a single storey, flat roofed building mainly faced in render. The planning history suggested it was originally two shop units (including a hair salon) which had been amalgamated to form one store. To the south, set slightly below the application land and alongside Broster Avenue, was a cluster of pairs of small semi-detached bungalows. The nearest had rear elevations facing towards the site. To the east, on the other side of the roundabout, was another retail convenience shop reliant upon on-street parking. To the south east of the application site, along Braithwaite Avenue, was a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses including No 57 whose rear garden abutted the application site, and was at a higher level than the application site. This adjoining house had a recently granted planning permission (19/03230/HOU) for a two storey side extension.

It was reported that 4 representations had been received which included 1 objection from a neighbouring property and 3 supporting the application, two of which were from Ward Councillors and the other from a local resident.

The summary of representations received in support included:

- the community would highly benefit from extra flats for which there was high demand in the area.
- One Ward Councillor supported the application and reported that if the officer recommendation was one of refusal that the matter be determined by the Planning Panel.
- Another Ward Councillor supported the application and stated that the access to the property would be in the footprint of the original build, utilising the store room to make a self- contained internal stairway; two parking spaces at the front of the shop were to be allocated for residents, these were existing spaces and access to them was from Brostser Road not directly from the roundabout; concerns that an extended build would have a detrimental impact and be imposing to 57 Braithwaite Avenue was not seen as reason to refuse; applicant was not in a position to knock down and rebuild rather than adding to the current structure as he would have to close down his means of income to rebuild. This was not only impractical due to the costs involved but it would also leave several local people unemployed during the rebuild.

It was reported that a neighbouring occupier objected as the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the garden and property (57 Broster Avenue).

Members were informed that Highways objected to the application as the proposal could lead to conditions prejudicial to pedestrian and highway safety due to the deficiencies of car parking for the flats and the retail store evident on the submitted plans. Highways Officers had queried whether the 6 parking were accurately shown on the plans. The spaces allocated to parking for the flats appeared to be too short and cars may be parked obstructing the footway.

Members were informed that the enlarged building would be only 1.2 metres off the property boundary of the bungalows at 47 and 49 Broster Avenue, and 8

metres away from the rear walls of those single storey bungalows. The bungalows were at a lower level and had habitable room windows (some to bedrooms) that faced towards the proposed development. Because the existing convenience store building was located on land at higher level than the bungalows at 47 and 49 Broster Avenue, the addition of a new storey and hipped roof would create a significantly greater mass and bulk in relation to these much lower bungalows. The extension would have a harmful impact on the amenities of occupiers of 47 and 49 Broster Avenue as it would cause overshadowing, and an overbearing and oppressive impact on their windows and the communal rear amenity space.

Members sought clarification on the suitability of the parking spaces available for the convenience store and the flats and the dropped kerb that would be needed.

A Ward Councillor spoke in support of the application and stated that the proposal would improve the area and the building and provided much needed employment ; car parking was not an issue as most of the customers walked to the shop; she had never seen all 6 car parking bays used at once.

A Keighley Town Councillor stated they were generally in support of the proposal.

The applicants representative spoke in support of the application and stated that the development would improve the area and that local businesses should be supported; there had been no objections from the residents of the bungalows; no 57 had previously been granted permission for an extension; the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the garden and property of no 57 Braithwaite Avenue; there was over a metre gap between the neighbouring property (no 57); parking could be accommodated as most people walked to the convenience store.

Several Members of the Panel emphasised that local business should be supported and that no objections had been received from the occupiers of 47 and 49 Broster Avenue and therefore felt the proposal should be granted subject to the issue of parking being addressed.

A Member raised concern about the overshadowing and overbearing impact of the proposal on numbers 47 and 49 Broster Avenue.

A number of Members also raised concerns about the parking arrangements proposed by the applicant as the two parking spaces closest to the roundabout would be operationally impracticable as vehicles would have to be reversing over the footway to gain access to them and the space nearest the roundabout was short in length and would be likely to lead to vehicles overhanging the footway affecting safety of pedestrians.

It was reported that in principle the more effective use of this site to create the flats and improve the appearance of the building was positive however, the proposal would lead to an intensification of use of the site and demand for parking; the off-street parking facilities were not adequate and there was concern that intensification would lead to pedestrian and highway safety problems around a relatively busy roundabout junction where there had been some history of personal injury accidents. Also, the proposed increase in height and bulk of the building would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of 57 Braithwaite Avenue, 47 and 49 Broster Avenue as it would cause overshadowing, an overbearing and oppressive impact on the windows and rear amenity spaces to those existing homes.

**Resolved-**

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

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**41. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

The Panel was asked to consider other matters which were set out in **Document “N”** relating to the following miscellaneous items:

- (a-b) Decisions made by the Secretary of State – Allowed
- (c-g) Decisions made by the Secretary of State – Dismissed

**DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

**Appeals Allowed**

<u>ITEM No.</u>	<u>WARD</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
(a)	Worth Valley	Land At Bingley Road Keighley  Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Material Change of Use - Case No: 17/00412/ENFUNA  Appeal Ref: 18/00129/APPENF
(b)	Worth Valley	Land At Bingley Road Keighley  Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Portal Frame Building - Case No: 17/00667/ENFUNA  Appeal Ref: 18/00128/APPENF

## Appeals Dismissed

<u>ITEM No.</u>	<u>WARD</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
(c)	Bingley	1 Priestthorpe Hall Park Road Bingley BD16 4EA  Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 17/00878/ENFUNA  Appeal Ref: 18/00162/APPENF
(d)	Worth Valley	14 Goodley Colne Road Oakworth Keighley West Yorkshire BD22 7PD  Replace rotting external doors (x2) and windows (x13) - Case No: 19/01071/LBC  Appeal Ref: 19/00119/APPLB2
(e)	Craven	36 High Street Steeton With Eastburn West Yorkshire BD20 6NT  Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 18/00802/ENFUNA  Appeal Ref: 19/00102/APPENF
(f)	Ilkley	51 Wyvil Crescent Ilkley West Yorkshire LS29 8ND  Part two and single storey rear extension - Case No: 19/01917/HOU  Appeal Ref: 19/00094/APPHOU
(g)	Craven	Land At Grid Ref 404072 445066 Keighley Road Silsden West Yorkshire  New caravan and cabin park - Case No: 18/04940/MAF  Appeal Ref: 19/00115/APPFL2

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