

Minutes of a meeting of the Regulatory and Appeals Committee held Remotely on Thursday, 15 April 2021 in

Commenced 10.00 am
Concluded 2.25 pm

Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT AND INDEPENDENT GROUP
Warburton Wainwright Godwin Kamran Hussain	Ali	Reid

Observers: Councillors Firth and Slater (Minute 70 & 71)

Apologies: Councillor John Pennington

Councillor Warburton in the Chair

65. CHAIRS OPENING REMARKS

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, the Committee observed a one minute silence in memory of HRH Prince Phillip, Duke of Edinburgh following his passing on 9 April 2021.

66. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

In the interest of clarity, Councillors Warburton and Wainwright disclosed that they had previously been on the Committee when the outline planning permission pertaining to Redwood Close, Long Lee had been discussed (Minute 70) but they stated that they would undertake to consider the application on the basis of the information presented at today's meeting only.

ACTION: City Solicitor

67. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meetings held on 27 August 2020, 11 February 2021, 11 March 2021 and 11 March 2021 (sitting as trustees) be signed as a correct record.

68. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

No requests were made to review restrictions on reports or background documents.

69. MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES

Resolved –

The following Membership changes be approved:

- (1) That Councillor Pollard be appointed to the Housing and Non Domestic Rates Panel.**
- (2) That Councillor Davies be appointed as an alternate member on the Miscellaneous Licensing Panel.**
- (3) That Chief Inspector Daniel Ware be appointed to the Corporate Parenting Panel as a non-voting co-opted member representing West Yorkshire Police.**

ACTION: City Solicitor

70. LONG LEE LANE, LONG LEE, KEIGHLEY - 20/05577/FUL

The Assistant Director, Planning, Transportation and Highways presented a report (**Document “BE”**) which explained a full application made for the demolition of dwellings and farm buildings and the construction of nine dwellings with associated landscaping and access road at Long Lee Lane, Long Lee, Keighley.

The Assistant Director gave an overview of the application which was detailed in the report, showing photographs of the site and the adjoining area, as well as the elevations and an artistic impression of the proposed development. He also summarised the representations that had been received. He stated that although this application had a relationship with the Redwood Close application, in that the applicant was the same, this application should be considered as a stand-alone application.

A late representation pertaining to the safety of road users and their ability to access Long Lee and the site was alluded to.

In relation to the presence of bat(s) on the site appropriate mitigation in the form of a licence would have to be applied for by the applicant. The boundary walls would be retained and it was intended that any boundary treatment would be detailed in a separate submission from the applicant at a later date.

In terms of drainage and water run off these were considered acceptable together with the proposal meeting highway visibility requirements.

There was no affordable housing element proposed as the houses would be offered on a shared ownership basis to prospective customers, and the application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to the report.

In relation to a comment from a Councillor that the Coney Lane bridge was very narrow and that this could have an impact on the development, he ascertained what measures had been undertaken to alleviate this. In response the Highways Engineer stated that some traffic would turn left to go to Harden or to right to Keighley, however the peak traffic flows were not massive and given the accident record was good in this area, as long as construction traffic was mindful of the low bridge, he did not feel that this development would cause undue highway safety concerns or significant additional vehicle movements.

In response to a question regarding the bat(s) on the site and drainage issues, it was stressed that the presence of bat(s) was covered by separate legislation, and the onus was on the applicant to apply for a licence in order that any bat(s) on the site were protected. In relation to the issue of drainage, surface water drainage details, flows and discharge levels would be submitted and agreed with the Council's drainage section and appropriately conditioned upon submission of the details by the developer.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and stated that the development in Long Lee and the surrounding areas as a whole must be considered alongside the unsuitability of the road and rail bridges at the bottom of Park Lane where it meets Coney Lane and the dog leg they create. This is one of several sites earmarked for development in Long Lee and they should not be allowed to go ahead without the issue of these bridges being addressed.

There was a constraint for many years on building in the area due to the bridges – several sites were earmarked on the housing plan in the mid-1990s, then safeguarded in 2005. The constraint was removed for some unknown and illogical reason in recent years which, is unwise at best as no improvements have been made to those bridges.

The Redwood Close site would be the second large development to go ahead in the village in as many years – the other being built currently at Long Lee Lane, locally referred to as the Park Lane development. That development of 61 houses was approved in November 2019. However, after concerns were raised the Committee deliberated over the highway constraints at Coney Lane bridge and decided that further residential developments in Long Lee should be put on hold until these constraints have been addressed. On the decision sheet, it was resolved that a footnote be added that any further development beyond that application would impact on access to Keighley over the Coney Lane bridge. This

access application is indeed a further residential development, yet the Coney Lane and Park Lane rail and road bridges are still there, still flooding in the basin, still almost impassable by large vehicles, still being struck by lorries, still creating a dog leg, and still have not been improved. The Ward Councillor urged the Committee to reject the application on that point alone.

The latest ecological report, and residents, confirm there is at least one bat living in the barn. The barn was going to be retained in the original plans in 2017, when the preliminary ecological appraisal recommendation said: "It is recommended that the proposed development of the site incorporates a buffer of at least 10m between the farmhouse and barns and construction footprint to avoid any disturbance to bats which could be roosting in these buildings."

In the latest plans the barn would be torn down, which would affect the bat's protected habitat. The Ward Councillor urged Members to reject this development on the basis that there is at least one bat in that barn and no plan in place to protect it.

Long Lee is an area prone to surface water flooding, and water run-off from the field already flows into the back gardens of homes on Long Lee Lane and Linden Rise. The capacity of our sewers in a time of climate change and increased water volume is already a concern without adding a whole new estate's run-off into them.

In the reports and submissions, Yorkshire Water and our own drainage specialist at the council were against the solution to waste water that has since been accepted. The site slopes at a steep angle on to the main route from Long Lee and surrounding villages into Keighley. Getting the drainage wrong will cause the council and other organisations major headaches regarding surface water flooding, gritting and ice, as well as mud on the road from any development, as we have learnt from the development further down Long Lee Lane.

Adept wrote the drainage strategy, and included an inspection and maintenance schedule in it. Who will be carrying out these inspections and making the repairs? Who is paying for them? And, crucially, will new home owners have the costs of repairing any faults, or will it be the council? Have our council gullies, clean team and been informed of the expectations laid out in the report.

In response to the issues raised by the Ward Councillor the Assistant Director stated that notwithstanding the issues that had been flagged up regarding the Coney Lane bridge, the two applications before the Committee would in total result in 41 houses being built which was a net reduction of 4 houses to the previous number proposed at outline stage for the Redwood Close application. In addition, concerns around the Coney Lane bridge had been looked at over many years. In relation to the bat(s) again as had been previously outlined, mitigation measures would have to be put in place by the developer, by law.

Another Ward Councillor spoke on objection to the application and stated that he agreed with all the points his fellow ward councillor had raised, and would now like to move on to issues with the design of the proposed development. Five gardens are within the overhead cable easement boundary, which is not acceptable. Concerns that the walkway leading between the two sites opens on to

open grassland in the south. The ecological survey has advised to limit lighting and ensure it does not disrupt habitats, so as a result there is concern about safety, and anti-social behaviour.

However, the application says lighting is “to be specified”, which is an issue for the reasons already mentioned, and also because the council is about to invest millions of pounds in an LED lighting scheme. If the lighting in this scheme does not match the council’s plans, new residents to the scheme would potentially have to pay to upgrade them for the development to be adopted, or we’ll adopt it then the taxpayer would have to foot the bill of any upgrades. He urged that if this application is approved, that Members include lighting plans as a condition, with the council street lighting team and the police as consultees.

He also echoed the concerns of the police regarding plots 34 and 35, which do not seem to have been taken into account in the updated site drawings.

Regarding the grassland meadow, who is going to maintain this? Who is paying for it? The police have also raised these queries as potential issues. That the site plan shows mature trees when there are that many on the site, but that is an aside, it looks like a wasteland.

As someone who share’s my Ward Councillor’s passion about the climate emergency, I know there should be an EV charge point for every parking bay. EV charge points are not marked on the site drawings despite them being a condition of the previous application. This is of particular concern where the parking areas are away from the house as electricity supply will need to be provided.

Drilling has already taken place on the land, which caused land movement. One resident’s patio cracked the day the drilling took place, and a crack appeared on someone else’s house. They are genuinely worried about sink holes due to the old mineshafts under the land, and they are seeking clarification from this committee about where they stand legally if their houses are damaged as a result of this development.

They also make a good point that an incinerator may be built in Marley, at the bottom of the valley below Long Lee. Residents feel that the area may become far less popular as a result and wonder if people would even buy these houses?

The setting out of the application as two separate sites has been confusing, and the few people who did receive a letter or information about the plans did not realise there were two separate applications. So people living at the bottom of the site thought there were only nine houses in the new scheme – a vast improvement on the 45 originally proposed, and presumably reduced in size due to the access being turned down last time. The same could be assumed by the few people on Redwood Close who got a letter. Incidentally, that did not include the elderly resident whose house is directly beside the access entrance. The north site even bleeds on to the Glen Lee Lane application, as the gardens of plots 9-12 can clearly be seen on the lower site plans. Planning officers should take this feedback on board, as splitting it into two applications has been perceived by residents to have been allowed “by the back door” with minimal scrutiny.

A wide scale public consultation was undertaken at outline planning stage, but the access application was rejected for very good reasons, and the design of the site has changed considerably from the original indicative proposal. It demands consultation. The offer in the statement to give people the chance to comment after an application has been passed is, quite frankly, contemptuous.

In response the Assistant Director stated that the issue of the overhead cables had been looked at; however, any diversion would be expensive and it was intended that these would remain in-situ. It was confirmed that there would be a footpath link between the two sites and that the lighting would be installed to the Council's current standards for street lighting. In terms of the advertising and the confusion around it, it was stressed that the two applications had been submitted by the applicant in good faith, notwithstanding that a previous outline permission had been granted for the Redwood Close site.

An objector was present at the meeting and stated that the original application for 45 houses has now been split into 2, this development of 9 houses and another 32. However, as the plan is fundamentally the same, it appears this is purely a means of bypassing the original concerns and decisions made in respect of access.

Although the original application was approved in 2018, this is the only opportunity we have had to put our concerns forward to the planning committee. Despite our objections at the time, the previous decision being made without any notification to interested parties that would have enabled us to make representations direct.

Not only is this land unsuitable for housing, but the proposed number of dwellings is excessive for the area involved – it exceeds the development further down Park Lane. The design of the housing is totally out of keeping with adjacent properties which are a mixture of bungalows and 2 storey houses, not 3 storeys. This is itself a change to the 2018 proposal.

We already have problems with antisocial behaviour, particularly from youths from outside Long Lee/Thwaites Brow. We are more isolated as we are farther away from town, with less police patrols. There are already a number of snickets and dark areas between houses which encourages litter and burglaries; additional housing is going to exacerbate this, potentially creating a no man's land in some places in the new development.

Due to the large number of bungalows in the area, a large % of the residents are elderly so will cause additional anxiety and suffering to these vulnerable people in particular.

Long Lee is historically and predominantly a rural area, surrounded by open moorland, fields and farmland. It is vital that the integrity of this is maintained and preserved. Long Lee is essentially a village environment, not a suburb of the heavily populated and built-up urban development of Bradford. Open space rather than built up areas is the ethos of Long Lee/Thwaites Brow and this environment and status must be protected for current and future generations.

The area in question is an extremely steep field, water runs down here and pools in the lower part of the field. There was a small amount of drilling done last year to

assess the quality of the land, potential for flooding, boggy areas etc. But this was done in the summer, during a particularly dry period so the findings are not representative of the reality. If housing is built here flooding is likely to those houses and existing adjacent houses.

What will be the impact of the building work, digging deep trenches etc – just the drilling I mentioned has damaged some properties. Cracks have appeared in patios.

What will be done to avoid this and to rectify any damage caused during or after the building work? What guarantee will be made that the cost of any repairs needed will be covered by the builders or council, not residents as house insurance policies will not cover this.

What measures have been taken to mitigate the possibility of subsidence in this area.

Where are the main utilities to be brought into the site from? Original plans showed a substantial amount of digging would be needed on Redwood to bring a water supply in.

How will the additional sewerage and rain water runoff be taken away – can the drainage/sewers cope? We have been led to believe these are already at capacity.

Building on this site will also have a detrimental impact on wildlife. There are bats in the deserted buildings and a number of owls have been seen and heard.

Affordable housing will attract young families. Whilst 9 houses will not greatly impact local schools, the full intended development will. Planning documents refer to a number of other available schools. However, none are within reasonable walking distance, particularly for primary school age children.

A further objector was present at the meeting and stated that any increase in road traffic access at the proposed entrance to the development site would pose a threat and danger to road and pedestrian users. The entrance is situated below the junction of Long Lee Lane and Harden Rd. Traffic approaching the entrance from Keighley has to effectively slow down for the junction and take an inside bend. I note that the Council previously preferred access at Redwood Close for the adjacent site development as a result of this. I cited in my previous objections 17/02809/MAO Land at Redwood Close that the Transport Statement stated that “there will be added pressure on the roads from increased vehicle use especially at peak times”. Statistics that were presented to support the application were out of date (2011) and thus inaccurate. A further Road traffic survey was undertaken in the summer of 2020. These findings are even less a true reflection of normal traffic usage due Covid-19 travel restrictions (reduced work travel and school traffic). As a resident of more than 30 years I can assure the Council that road traffic has increased substantially (more so than the 20% guided by the DoT over the past 10 years). There has also been a number of vehicle incidents / collisions. The majority of which go unreported to the local Police. Hence, inaccuracy of statistics used. If the proposal was to go ahead there would need to be some measure of traffic reduction / calming such as a 20 mile zone and / altered junction. All of which would incur considerable cost. Additionally, Long Lee is at a

significant elevation to be adversely affected by winter weather conditions which directly affects traffic.

What do the Council and/ or developers envisage to ensure the safety of local residents and road users?

What measures would be undertaken to protect and support the bat population.

In relation to the points raised by the objectors, the Assistant Director stated the type of housing in Long Lee was mixed and the proposed two storey dwellings would not be out of keeping. In relation to the issue of anti-social behaviour, he stressed that the footway was necessary as it would provide a link between the two sites and therefore a balance had to be struck.

In terms of the protection of any bat(s) on the site, the Highways Engineer stated that street lighting could be altered so that the bat corridor is not affected. In relation to the concerns raised regarding the Coney Lane Bridge in terms of the congestion, impact on the bridge and the upgrading of, it was stressed that it could be an issue that could be looked at by the Area Committee as suggested by Members, however it was not deemed appropriate to make a specific recommendation to the Area Committee, however the minutes of this Committee could be communicated to the Chair.

The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and stated that the over the two schemes 28 houses would be offered as affordable rented accommodation, the remaining 13 on a shared ownership basis. That a combined application had not been submitted as outline planning permission had already been granted on the Redwood Close site. That both schemes would be delivered imminently and that detailed landscaping and open spaces were proposed.

The Chair stated that the provision of EV charging points should be conditioned.

In relation to the issue of damage to a patio, the applicant assured Members that the site team will deal with any issues raised by residents during the construction phase. In addition, a bat survey would be done in accordance with the legislation.

A number of Members were minded to refuse the application on the grounds that the development would be detrimental to local residents by virtue of incomplete consultation; issues raised regards bat(s) on the site should be addressed prior to construction; highways concerns/issues affecting the Coney Lane bridge. However, in the absence of substantiating valid planning grounds to refuse the application, it was therefore:

Resolved –

That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the technical report at appendix 1 to Document “BE”, together with the following additional condition:

- (i) Before the date of first occupation, each house of the development shall be provided with access to a purpose built EV charging point. The charging points shall be provided in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall meet at least the following**

minimum standard for numbers and power output :- a Standard Electric Vehicle Charging point (of a minimum output of 16A/3.5kW) provided at every residential unit that has a dedicated parking space and/or garage. Buildings and parking spaces that are to be provided with charging points shall not be brought into use until the charging points are installed and operational and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To facilitate the uptake and use of low emission vehicles by future occupants and reduce the emission impact of traffic arising from the development in line with the council's Low Emission Strategy, policy EN8 of the Bradford Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Footnote: That it be drawn to the applicant's attention the requirement to make an application for a licence regarding the bat(s) on site.

ACTION: Assistant Director Transportation Design and Planning

71. REDWOOD CLOSE, LONG LEE, KEIGHLEY - 20/05576/MAR

The Committee was asked to consider **Document "BF"** which detailed a reserved matters application requesting consideration of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 32 dwellings (part pursuant to outline approval 17/02809/MAO) at Redwood Close, Long Lee, Keighley.

The Assistant Director gave an overview of the application which was detailed in the report, showing photographs of the site and the adjoining area, as well as the elevations and an artistic impression of the proposed development. He also summarised the representations that had been received, stating that the application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to the report.

In response to a question regarding vehicle access points between the two sites, it was stated that there was no proposal for a vehicular access point.

A Ward Councillor was present to represent residents of Long Lee and stated that the issue that worries residents the most, is that HGVs and large vehicles would need to access Redwood Close via Cherry Tree Rise and Dale View Road, which is one of the main routes to Long Lee Primary School. We are incredibly concerned for the welfare of the children and families who are pedestrians if there are multiple large vehicles using that route. We are concerned there could be an accident.

Our concerns stem from the fact the parking around Long Lee Primary School at key times is already incredibly busy, with cars parked on both sides of the road. Cars are often parked inconsiderately and block the way for larger vehicles, and there is a sharp bend on the approach to the school. Councillors raised this situation only a few weeks ago with police and highways officers, who visited the site and met the head teacher.

This traffic and parking situation already causes stress to residents living near the

school and were dubious about the practicalities of large vehicles being able to physically access the proposed site at peak times, also on Dale View Road and Redwood Close itself.

There is already serious traffic build-up in peak times and turning right out of Cherry Tree Rise towards Keighley is already a struggle, which will be exacerbated by any new houses.

There is also the question of snow and ice. Long Lee is exposed and at the top of a valley. The wind is harsh and is gets cold in winter, with drifts. It also sits on natural springs, so ice is common. The council, as per our policy, grits A roads and bus routes. However, despite this the bus regularly fails to service the estate this development would sit on due to parked cars being in the way or due to poor weather conditions. Indeed a few weeks ago an ambulance was unable to access Redwood Close to support a resident, who sadly passed away.

Moving on to the various drainage issues in Long Lee. Springs, blocked and broken culverts, water pouring out of walls, surface water run-off and flooding are already causing problems in several locations in the village and they have not yet been rectified. We object to the building on any land in Long Lee until the current issues are addressed and any developer can ensure drainage will be 100% effective, both land drainage and surface water. This is a particular concern on this Redwood Close site, as water run-off from the field already flows into the back gardens of homes on Long Lee Lane and Linden Rise. Taking away the fields could exacerbate this problem and cause more run-off, impacting the properties as well as the gardens.

Any development in Long Lee and the surrounding areas as a whole must be considered alongside the unsuitability of the road and rail bridges at the bottom of Park Lane where it meets Coney Lane and the dog leg they create. Several sites are earmarked for development in Long Lee and they should not be allowed to go ahead without the issue of these bridges being addressed. There was a constraint for many years on building in the area due to the bridges – several sites were earmarked on the housing plan in the mid-1990s, then safeguarded in 2005. The constraint was removed for some unknown and illogical reason in recent years which, to me, is unwise at best as no improvements have been made to those bridges.

The Redwood Close site would be the second large development to go ahead in the village in as many years – the other being built currently at Long Lee Lane, locally referred to as the Park Lane development. That development of 61 houses was approved in November 2019. However, after I raised concerns the Committee deliberated over the highway constraints at Coney Lane bridge and decided that further residential developments in Long Lee should be put on hold until these constraints have been addressed. On the decision sheet, it was resolved that a footnote be added that any further development beyond that application would impact on access to Keighley over the Coney Lane bridge. This access application is indeed a further residential development, yet the Coney Lane and Park Lane rail and road bridges are still there, still flooding in the basin, still almost impassable by large vehicles, still being struck by lorries, still creating a dog leg, and still have not been improved. The Ward Councillor therefore urged the Committee to reject the application.

The City Solicitor stressed that many of the points raised by the Ward Councillor were not material to this planning application, as they had already been considered at the outline application stage.

A further Ward Councillor spoke in objection and stated that he concurred with the concerns expressed by his fellow Ward Councillor's residents that the access to this development is not suitable.

In addition, the condition of the proposed access road Redwood Close near and at the point of access to the proposed development has collapsed in parts and the surface is in need of repair. I understand from speaking to highways officers that the council will resurface the road in this financial year. However, there was concerns the road will still not cope with large HGVs as the foundations of the road is sinking – it's not simply a resurfacing issue.

It's also worth noting Redwood Close is steep, narrow, has no turning circle, and can certainly not cope with any large vehicles parking on it. The proposed entrance to the linked development on Long Lee Lane is also narrow, so would also be difficult for HGVs to access. Redwood Close would also suffer greatly if the road were to be allowed to become even slightly muddy – the steepness would be a hazard to pedestrians and motorists, and combined with icy conditions in a built-up area it could be a disaster waiting to happen should a vehicle lose control.

A Member raised concerns around parking in the vicinity of the site by trades persons during construction, and if this could be conditioned, so that they parked on site. In response it was stressed that as long as there were no particular parking restrictions, it could not be conditioned, however the construction management plan could include such a clause to encourage parking on the site.

A Member also suggested that a dilapidation survey be undertaken prior to construction so that any damage to adjoining roads can be made good post construction.

An objector was present and stated that Redwood Close is small cul de sac, currently serving 44 houses. It is narrow, with a very steep incline and a tight left corner at the top of that incline.

In winter it is frequently inaccessible, only a small amount of snow and ice stops most cars from safely going up or down it. Cars are usually parked on both sides of the road, so the access is particularly narrow. It is infrequently gritted. And the proposal to provide grit boxes is not a reasonable solution to this problem.

Last winter an ambulance was unable to access Redwood to attend a patient and they subsequently died.

The only access to Redwood is via Daleview Road. This is a bus route, but buses cannot access it in bad weather either and, as it is a residential street, cars are parked at both sides further restricting easy access. If buses have a problem on Daleview, so will construction traffic.

These roads (and other adjacent roads, Cherry Tree/Spring Avenue) are unsuitable for the heavy plant vehicles which will be needed for the construction. There are many children around, parents taking children to school (with pushchairs) and children playing out during holidays and after school. Any access problems to the site due to parked cars and during bad weather would be extremely hazardous and dangerous and a real threat to life.

The number of extra cars driving up and down Redwood and to the main road could potentially almost double once the properties are built, again a danger to life and a real hazard due to parked cars and the road conditions in winter. And these roads are a direct route to the primary school on Cherry Tree Rise.

A further objector was present and drew Members' attention to the following points:

That road traffic had increased substantially in the area over the years and increase traffic through Long Lee in particular because of the Covid vaccination roll out.

That in terms of the roosting bats, I made several observations regarding anomalies in the Preliminary ecological appraisal. It is also noted that a second Ecological report was submitted from a different provider. Which did not include a full assessment of the barn, farm and derelict buildings due to the state of repair and would therefore question the validity of this report.

That the height of the walls is such that they would not provide security and seclusion from new residents and others.

The gradient and slope of the site falls from north to south and also towards the lower west boundary where there is a ditch and old drainage pipework. This area of marshy grassland is boggy and wet throughout the year. The site has a spring which flows towards Low Fold. Issues which could affect neighbouring properties re surface flooding. What measures will be undertaken to improve removal of surface water?

In response to some of the issues raised, the Assistant Director stated that boundary wall treatment will form part of the landscaping scheme and details and any remedies can be looked at upon submission and taken up with the developer accordingly. In addition, any drainage issues will be looked at in light of the details submitted by the applicant.

The applicant's agent was also present and stated that his principle comments had already been expressed on the previous application, suffice to say that this application was now for 32 units, and hence the density was lower. In terms of separation distances and layout, these were compliant with planning policy and that the boundary treatment would be enhanced to ensure privacy of existing residents was maintained. In terms of traffic management during construction, as a considerate contractor the aim would be to ensure that relationships with the local community are strengthened and managed via the construction management plan. In terms of drainage a fully designed and technically compliant scheme which will take surface and foul water from the upper part of the site and down through to the lower site, in addition surface water storage was being proposed and therefore a robust drainage scheme would be in place.

In terms of the issue of density, as had been highlighted previously, the density now proposed was lower.

Members were in broad support of the proposals and it was therefore:

Resolved –

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the technical report attached as appendix 1 to Document “BF”, together with an additional condition requiring a dilapidation survey to be undertaken on the adjacent roads used by construction traffic.

ACTION: Assistant Director Transportation, Design and Planning

72. THE OLD BUILDING, GREAT HORTON ROAD, BRADFORD - 20/01222/LBC

The Committee was asked to consider **Document “BH”** which explained a listed building application seeking consent for works to effect the change of use and conversion of D1 education use of the former Old Building to form up to 190 C3 residential apartments including 24/7 concierge, media centre, café, games room, gymnasium and multi-purpose hall with landscaped courtyard.

The Assistant Director stressed that no objections had been received to the this application and it was therefore:

Resolved –

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained within the technical report attached as appendix 1 to Document “BH”.

ACTION: Assistant Director Transportation Design and Planning

73. THE OLD BUILDING, GREAT HORTON ROAD, BRADFORD - 20/01221/MAF

The Assistant Director, Transportation, Planning and Highways presented a report (**Document “BG”**) which explained a full planning application for a change of use and conversion of D1 education use of the former Old Building to form up to 190 C3 residential apartments including 24/7 concierge, media centre, café, games room, gymnasium and multi-purpose hall with landscaped communal courtyard.

The Assistant Director gave an overview of the application which was detailed in the report, showing photographs of the site and the adjoining area, as well as the elevations and an artistic impression of the proposed development. He also summarised the representations that had been received.

In the absence of any on site provision for car parking, the Assistant Director drew Member’s attention to the car parking provision that was being proposed off site at the NCP Car Park off Thornton Road. This would equate to 45 parking spaces.

There was no provision for affordable housing given the expected low yield in respect of final sales. However the site would bring back into use a key city centre landmark building, as well as providing housing and contributing to the city centre economy.

During the initial comment stage a number of Members raised concerns around the lack of car parking and suggested that the provision being offered off site should be better conditioned so that its available for at least the first five years, with the provision of ebikes/scooters which are street legal.

In response the Assistant Director stated that given this was a city centre site, it was felt that the proposed car parking was adequate as no other suitable land for car parking had been identified, despite best endeavours.

The Highways Engineer stressed that in light of the Councils incoming Clean Air zone, reducing car usage was central and therefore the above measures would contribute to this.

The Applicant's agent was present at the meeting and stated that a lot of work had gone into developing a viable scheme. The Plan was to create a digital hub and encourage university postgraduates to take up residence. Additional restaurant and shops would add to the vitality of the scheme. In terms of the car parking provision, the proposed parking would cost in the region of £1,000 per annum per customer.

Resolved –

That the application be approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement and conditions contained in the technical report attached as appendix 1 to Document “BG”, subject to an amendment of the Section 106 regarding car parking so that 45 contract parking will be provided at the NCP car park, Southgate, Bradford for a period of 5 years. If this provision becomes unavailable then the parking be provided with another local car parking company for the remainder of the 5 year period. This to also include an agreement with the applicant for the provision of ebikes/scooters which are street legal.

ACTION : Assistant Director Transportation Design and Planning

Chair

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