

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 28 July 2021 in the Banqueting Hall - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.05 am
Concluded 12.30 pm

Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	GREEN
Lee Godwin Arshad Hussain	Barker Whitaker	Love

Observers: Councillor Clarke in Minute 46(d) and Councillor Firth Minute 46 (e).

Councillor Lee in the Chair

42. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

- (a) In the interest of transparency Councillor Godwin disclosed an interest in Minute 46 (a) as the representative was known to him, 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 Whitaker disclosed a prejudicial interest in Minute 46 (d) as she had discussions with the objector and left the meeting during consideration and voting of this item.
- (c) In the interest of transparency Councillor Lee disclosed an interest in Minute 46 (c) as one of the representatives was at the same golf club as her husband and was within her Ward, however, she had not disclosed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties.
- (d) In the interest of transparency Councillor Lee disclosed an interest in Minute 46 (e) as the application was within her Ward, however, she had not disclosed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties.
- (e) In the interest of transparency Councillor Lee disclosed an interest in Minute 46 (a) as the objector was known to her, however, she had not disclosed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with

any interested parties.

- (f) In the interest of transparency all Members disclosed an interest in Minute 46 (f) as the applicant was known to them, however, they had not disclosed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties

Action: City Solicitor

43. MINUTES

That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 February 2020 be signed as a correct record.

44. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

45. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

46. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

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

(a) 19 WHARFEDALE DRIVE, ILKLEY

Householder application for an upward extension to form a two-storey contemporary dwelling house at 19, Wharfedale Drive, Ilkley.

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 Wharfedale Drive was a cul de sac to the east of Ilkley town centre off Bolling Road. It was lined by mid-C20th, mostly semi-detached houses, in a variety of designs with many built with stone to the ground floor and render or pebbledash above. The application property at No. 19 was a stone fronted bungalow of more recent (early 1990's) construction. The side and rear were rendered. Many of the houses along the street had been extended at the sides. The property at No 17 Wharfedale Drive had been enlarged at the side twice, with a chamfered 1-1/2 storey extension with dormer window forming an annexe that had been added to a more conventional two-storey side extension.

Members were informed that Ilkley Town Council wished to record a neutral position on this application. The Plans Committee also remained neutral with regard to the revised drawings and had no further comments to add.

It was reported that 3 objections had been received, including one on behalf of 4 occupiers of the adjacent house and its annexe; 4 representations supporting the application have been received; 1 "neutral" comment.

In addition, comments from all 3 Ilkley Ward Councillors had been received with requests that the application be considered by Panel and raising matters of concerns from residents regarding the inconsistent design, over-development and a loss of privacy and light.

The Chair stressed that when Ward Councillors wished the application to be considered by the Planning Panel it was imperative that they attend the meeting.

It was reported that this proposal to enlarge the existing single-storey property upwards to create a contemporary two-storey home would be appropriate to the site's context and would enhance the quality of the original bungalow and thereby improve the wider area. The scheme design was in accordance with design principles of the Council's Householder policies. It would not be imposing or out of scale with the local context. The proposal was not considered to significantly affect the outlook, daylight or privacy of occupiers of any of the adjoining dwellings and it maintained amenity for existing and future occupiers of adjoining land and buildings in accordance with Core Strategy Policy.

An objector attended the meeting and made the following comments:

- The proposal was an over development.
- The contemporary design was inconsistent with properties in the area and not in keeping within the residential area.
- The impact the two storey development would have on neighbouring properties.
- It was not an extension but a new dwelling.
- Impact on no 17 was significant.
- Application should be deferred for further investigation.

The applicant attended the meeting and made the following comments:

- The design of the dwelling was carefully considered so that it would not cause any impact on neighbours.
- Design was considered taking into account the neighbours concerns.
- Just wanted a 3 good size bedroom house which would be our forever home.
- The design chosen minimised the impact on neighbours.
- Neighbours had given their support.
- The design would include lighter render and further stone.
- Wanted a house to be proud of.

A neighbour who supported the proposal made the following comments:

- Welcomed the modern design.
- The roof line had been kept to a minimum – great deal of thought put into the design to minimise any negative impact.
- Properties in the area were of a mixed design.
- Seen many contemporary designs in Ilkley.
- The development would enhance the area.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place’s technical report (Document “A”).

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(b) 28 PLUMPTON END, BRADFORD

Two storey side and rear extension, hip to gable extension with front and rear dormer windows (revised plans) at 28, Plumpton End, Wrose, Bradford.

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 application property was semi-detached house on the east side of Plumpton End which was a cul-de-sac. The house was 2-storeys in height and had previously been extended to the rear with a conservatory and kitchen. The ground floor part of the front elevation was faced in stone and remaining walls above were finished in render. Adjacent to the house was a driveway which lead towards a detached garage to the rear.

It was reported that the application was originally submitted and the subsequent revised plans were separately publicised by way of neighbour notification letters. In response to the publicity, the Council had received 27 objections, 3 supporting comments and 1 general comment. For brevity the representations were summarised and only the matters raised which were material in considering an application were listed. Summary of the objections received were detailed in the report.

Members were informed that the proposal was not considered to be harmful to residential amenity, visual amenity or highway safety and was therefore considered to comply with the relevant policies.

In response to a Members question it was reported that having a front dormer was not against rules and that it sat comfortably on the roof without any negative impact.

The applicants father attended the meeting and spoke in support of the application and stated that the neighbour complaining had a conservatory longer than his sons proposed extension and that some of the objectors that had complained were not impacted by the extension.

Members sought clarification on the length of the development and the dormer windows.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the

conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report (Document "A").

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(c) 5 WESTFIELD DRIVE, RIDDLESDEN, KEIGHLEY

Householder application for change of roof from hip to gable, rear dormer window plus two storey side and single storey rear extensions at 5 Westfield Drive, Riddlesden, Keighley.

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 application sought permission for various extensions to a semi-detached dwelling in a residential area of Riddlesden. The street sloped steeply from north to south meaning that the application dwelling at No. 5 sat higher than the adjacent dwelling to the south, No. 3. The house was constructed with stone cladding to the ground floor at the front. Above the stone, the walls were clad in painted render. A small gabled projection was a feature of the front elevation. There was a red clay tiled hipped roof. To the rear was a garden that backed onto the gardens of houses on Westfield Crescent.

It was reported that Keighley Town Council recommended approval. The application was advertised by neighbour notification letters; 2 letters received objecting to the proposal and a petition signed by 6 local residents had been received and sought referral of the application to the Planning Panel. Grounds for objection were the loss of privacy due to overlooking from the new bedroom window into the garden of 3 Westfield Drive, and the overshadowing and loss of light to the neighbouring property caused by the bulky presence of the two storey extension. Also referred to negative impacts on highway safety and amenity for all residents caused by the reduction in parking in the curtilage of the application property, exacerbated by what would be a 7 bedroom house. Members raised concern and sought clarification on the size and appearance of the proposed extension which was going from a 3 bedroom to a 7 bedroom dwelling.

In response to Members questions it was reported that there were houses of a different design in the area but this proposal was greater in scale than the others.

It was reported that the extension would result in one off street parking space being retained a concern had been expressed by the objectors that this would lead to cars being parked on Westfield Drive.

Two objectors attended the meeting and made the following comments:

- The officers report did not say anything favourable about the application.
- A large proportion of the garden would be lost to the development.
- There would be loss of privacy, overlooking and overshadowing caused by the scale of the extension.
- There would be an impact on highway safety due to the reduction of off street parking spaces.
- 2 storey would block direct sunlight.

- 7 bedroom house would need a number of parking spaces.

Members felt that that the scale of the enlargements would be overdevelopment of the original dwelling; concerned about the character and appearance of the dwelling; overbearing effect on neighbours and the reduction of off street parking.

Resolved-

That the application be refused due to:

- (1) The scale of the enlargements would be overdevelopment of the original dwelling.**
- (2) The aspects of the design, such as the large rear dormer and awkward junction between the roofs would harm the character and appearance of the original dwelling.**
- (3) The size and position of the proposed side extension would cause overbearing effects on No 3 Westfield Drive.**
- (4) The development would reduce the number of useable off-street parking spaces to insufficient levels, causing congestion on Westfield Drive.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place

- (d) 81 BOLTON ROAD, SILSDEN**

Full application for the construction of detached dwelling at land to the rear of 81 Bolton Road, Silsden.

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 ha, former garden area until recently associated with the terrace house at 81 Bolton Road. The small plot was separated from the back yard of the dwellings by an unsurfaced access serving the back of the terrace. Another similar plot of land existed to the north. Access to the site was from either Townhead or Bolton Road via a poorly surface unadopted access. The surrounding area was mainly residential characterised by a tight grain of development, with older housing along Townhead and other garages and outbuildings to the north east accessed off the unmade track.

The site had recently been cleared with a view to implementing planning permission 19/05189/FUL.

It was reported that Silsden Parish Town Council – Objection related to overdevelopment and drainage concerns; it was imperative that the location of the culvert was known; photographic evidence of the existence of the culvert had been sent to planning in Bradford separately. Silsden Town Council supported the local objections.

The application was advertised by neighbour notification letters; overall expiry date was 13th March 2021; 19 objections were received to the proposal including a ward member. A summary of the objections were detailed in the report.

It was reported that written objections from residents of Town Head and Bolton Road had also been submitted which comprised of six pages including photographs which had been sent to all Members of the Panel earlier on in the week. The Planning officer referred to the additional information in his power point presentation.

Members were informed that this site previously had planning permissions, including extant permission 19/05189/FUL, which had established the principle of constructing a dwelling on the land. There have been no material changes in policy or circumstances since those decisions. The dwelling proposed by this application was of greater height and therefore massing. However, the resulting building was smaller than proposed under refused applications and it would not be unduly dominant or intrusive. It would not have any material adverse effects on the amenity of adjoining occupiers or highway safety. The concerns relating to the possibility of an unrecorded culvert can, again, be dealt with by a planning condition requiring pre-commencement investigation.

A Silsden Town Councillor attended the meeting and made the following comments in support of the objectors:

- A ground survey needed to be undertaken to establish the location of the culvert that ran under the site.
- Back street flooded which caused considerable damage to the road and gardens.
- Concern for future flooding.
- Land drainage passed not knowing where drains were.

A Ward Councillor attended the meeting in support of the objections and reiterated the comments made by the Silsden Town Councillor and reported that the height of the dwelling would cause a loss of privacy for surrounding dwellings; the road was too narrow to accommodate more parking and vehicle trips to the site and that it would cause an increase pressure on the highway.

The Chair stressed that the issues relating to the culvert would be looked at before any work was started.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place’s technical report (Document “A”).

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(e) **BACK SHAW FARM, 5 BACK SHAW LANE, KEIGHLEY**

Conversion of barn to dwelling house with associated parking and landscaping. Land at Back Shaw Farm, 5 Back Shaw Lane, Keighley.

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 application was for conversion of a barn to a dwelling house with associated parking and landscaping on land at Back Shaw Farm, 5 Back Shaw Lane, Keighley. It was considered at the meeting of the former District Planning Panel on Wednesday 28 April 2021. Officers recommended approval of the application for reasons set out in the report.

Members of the Panel on 28 April heard representations from a Ward Councillor who raised a number of matters on behalf of neighbours to the development site, particularly referring to nuisance arising from activities at the site and concerning various unauthorised items on the land.

The April Planning Panel meeting resolved -

“That the decision be deferred and brought back to the Planning Panel in 2 months on the understanding that:

1. The applicant will submit a S106 unilateral undertaking committing to work being completed with 18 months
2. That all items associated with the construction (that may be allowed under permitted development rights) will be removed from site on completion of the conversion work.

AND

Subject to an additional condition to those set out in the existing Officer report:

Condition 8 - Construction work shall only be carried out between the hours of 0730 and 1800 on Mondays to Fridays, 0730 and 1300 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.”

Officers were now bringing the application back to the first available Panel meeting.

It was reported that a Section 106 agreement incorporating the necessary requirements had been drafted by Legal Services and submitted to the applicant. Its terms had been accepted in principle by the applicant. The additional condition relating to plant, machinery etc being removed from the land by no later than eighteen months from the date of the agreement listed in the report would be incorporated into the list of conditions.

Members were informed that officers were recommending that authority to approve the application be delegated to the Director once the Agreement has been fully completed and executed.

A Ward Member attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and made the following points:

- Applicant was given permitted development rights 4 years ago but no development had been undertaken.
- Backshaw Lane was in the Green Belt.
- The turning circle was unsuitable.
- The area was becoming residential rather than being rural – area should be protected.
- A large poly tunnel and stables had been erected without permission.
- Concerned about the noise and traffic from the additional development as well as noise from other vehicles.
- Condition of the road was not adequate and needed resurfacing.
- It was a single lane track – cars parked there – it was a mess.

In response to Members questions the Highway Officer reported that Back Shaw Farm was on the list of highway schemes to be undertaken in the future.

It was reported that electrical vehicle charging points were not a requirement for single dwellings.

An objector attended the meeting and made the following comments:

- There had been ample time to get the work completed; no conversion had been undertaken since permission was granted.
- There were trees and bushes surrounding the barn – removal of them would cause harm to local wildlife.
- The sight was an eyesore.
- Currently the owner used the site as a car transporter business.
- Change of use did not fit with the listed building and was not suited to surrounding properties.
- Noise abatement notice should be looked at – noise was emanating from work being undertaken on weekends and evenings.
- The development can be completed in 12 months.
- The situation had caused a strain on local residents as well as the future impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.
- No further development should be allowed otherwise owner would continue to build.
- This was a farming area and impacted on Green Belt.

In response to the comments raised by the objector and Ward Councillor it was reported that issues relating to the car business etc were being investigated separately; this application was to consider the conversion of a barn; the scheme was looked at by the conservation team who felt that the building would be set away from the barn to cause any harm.

The Chair stressed that the land needed to be cleared by the owner otherwise the Council will enforce removal of any items which remained on the land which were in breach of the condition set out in the s106; in the event that the s.106 was not

signed within two months from today, the application should be refused due to harm to visual amenity and the amenity of neighbouring residents caused by the condition of the land.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place’s technical report and subject to the terms of the draft s.106 Agreement.

That the Strategic Director, Place be authorised to issue the planning permission subject to the s.106 being signed and authorised.

In the event that the s.106 is not signed within two months from 28 July 2021, the application should be refused due to harm to visual amenity and the amenity of neighbouring residents caused by the condition of the land.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(f) GREAT STONES FARM, STONE LANE, OXENHOPE, KEIGHLEY

Householder application for a utility room extension at Great Stones Farm, Stone Lane, Oxenhope.

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 property was a house formed in a converted barn. It stood in a cluster of converted former barns and cottages in a rural location alongside Stone Lane. This lane was a single track road off Shaw Lane, that climbs into the upland countryside outside Oxenhope. The site was in the Green Belt.

It was reported that Oxenhope Village Council supported this planning application and no representations had been received.

Members were informed that this proposal was for a modest and subservient extension that would complement the existing grouping of traditional farm buildings and had no detrimental effects on local amenity or the character of the landscape. It was sufficiently disproportionate so as not to conflict with Green Belt policy. It complied with all the listed Core Strategy policies.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place’s technical report (Document “A”).

Action: Strategic Director, Place

47. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

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

(a-b) Requests for Enforcement/Prosecution Action.

(c) Decisions made by the Secretary of State – Dismissed

Resolved –

That the requests for Enforcement/Prosecution Action and the decisions made by the Secretary of State as set out in Document “B” be noted.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

Chair

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

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