

## Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 26 October 2022 in Council Chamber - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.05 am  
Concluded 11.25 am

### Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	GREEN
Lee Amran Humphreys Jamil	Barker Nazam	Warnes

Apologies: Councillor Arshad Hussain

### Councillor Lee in the Chair

#### 12. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

In the interests of transparency, the following declarations were made in relation to items contained within **Document “D”** (Minute no. 16)

Cllr G Barker – item A was in his Ward

Cllr Amran – item B - was acquainted with the agent

Cllr Nazam – item B - was acquainted with the applicant

**Document “E”** (Minute no.17)

Cllr K Warnes – items A & L. Involved as Ward Councillor seeking enforcement.

**Action: Director of Legal and Governance**

#### 13. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meetings held on 29 June and 13 July 2022 be signed as a correct record.

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

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

**15. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No public questions were received.

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

**(A) Land At Grid Ref 415820 444018 Moor Lane Menston Ilkley West  
Yorkshire - 22/02914/FUL**

**Wharfedale**

This was a full planning application for conversion of an existing agricultural building to a detached dwelling house (C3 use) on land at Moor Lane, Menston.

The application proposed the conversion of a storage building which had a steel portal frame and was faced partly in stone to its lower part, with a dull green coloured cladding to the upper section and roof. The building stood on a parcel of land on the corner of Hillings Lane and Moor Lane with a gated access onto Moor Lane. It was set back towards the rear corner of the plot and was not especially prominent due to a large amount of conifer tree cover around the edges of the plot which obscured the building from the adopted roads. The surrounding area was rural in nature but there were residential properties set along both highways at irregular intervals - including houses lining Moor Lane to the east. The site was located within the Green Belt and in the Wharfedale Landscape Character Area.

Officers presented the application including details of the site history with supporting photographs. The site had originally been used in connection with the sale of Christmas trees but this had lapsed. A summary of support and objections from the circulated report was provided stating that the only alteration in appearance would be to the glazing. A previous application was refused but this related to demolishing the existing structure and a new build, the application presented was to grant permission for re-use with no substantial re-build. Officers summarised the structural report to support their view noting that the outside would be re-cladded. They further stated that there would be no impact in relation to additional access requirements and there was no greater effect on openness. Members were shown access and egress which were set away from the nearby road junction and stated that there would no significant traffic from the site and vehicle turning would be contained within. Officers stated that the scheme was restrained and on a well-covered site. They also clarified that permitted development rights to change to residential were rejected as the building was not previously used as strictly defined as agricultural.

Members were then given the opportunity to comment and ask questions, the details of which and the responses given are as below.

- Would some trees be cleared? Officers advised that the trees were being retained but were not protected
- Could future tree clearing be prevented by conditions? Officers advised that trees would require a Tree Protection Order (TPO) but could be circumvented and would need a good planning reason to include. A tree scheme could be required as part of planning permission, added as a landscape proposal to keep and re-stock with better trees.

A representative from the local Parish Council attended the meeting and with the Chair's permission addressed the Panel as an objector to the application stating the following reasons

- The site was on the green belt
- Sustainability concerns
- Inappropriate development as the Parish Council did not agree that the application was a conversion and did not meet the criteria as in the NPPF (section 150 paragraph D)
- Significant, disproportionate addition
- Previous refusal still relevant
- Sets a precedent for development on green belt
- Poor design, out of character
- Concerns regarding the removal of trees and future extensions

Planning Officers responded to the objectors concerns and stated the following:

- An explanation of the re-use test from NPPF paragraph 150 re-affirming the structural report as supporting evidence to the test.
- There was no greater impact than the existing structure on openness
- restricted curtilage (condition 5 - restricted curtilage)
- Future development addressed by removing permitted development rights as in condition 4 of the application

The applicants also attended the meeting and with the Chair's permission addressed the Panel and stated the following:

- The ambition was for a smaller, eco-friendly home
- Their agent had provided information to the Parish Council regarding the conversion, not a new building
- The sycamores in the photos were not on their property
- Conifers would be retained to reduce noise
- Details of car usage on the site were also provided

**Resolved -**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place' technical report (Document "D")**

**(B) 12 View Road Keighley West Yorkshire BD20 6JL - 22/02632/HOU  
Keighley Central**

This was a householder application for the construction of front dormer windows, demolition of existing bay windows, existing conservatory and lean to roof and the formation of central glazed atrium and flat roof to rear extension at 12 View Road Keighley, BD20 6JL.

Officers presented the application with site views, photos and plans showing the proposed look of the dwelling. They stated that some additional engineering information had been received but was too late for assessment as 48 hours was needed to do this.

The plans presented showed that the proposal would make the dwelling higher than neighbouring properties and stated their concerns that the scale and quality of the proposal was not in accordance with SPD, DS1 and DS3. The impact on neighbours' privacy and rear dominance was considered as unacceptable and the scale and design were the reasons for recommending refusal.

Members were then given the opportunity to comment and ask questions, the details of which and the responses given are as below.

- Had the neighbours objected? Officers advised that the immediate neighbours had not.
- Was it possible to scale it down, what was the problem, height or design? Officers advised that it was the overall impact which they considered needed to be re-thought
- In relation to the height of the existing dwelling, could trees be added to enclose the site? Officers advised that it was possible due to the slope but would not resolve the issue as the design and scale had to be acceptable
- If the roof was still intact, would dormers be permitted? Officers advised that they could not be added to the existing house if it was being re-designed.
- The increase in height, the flat room and atrium etc., are these all together was it determined as excess? Officers responded that it was.

The agent for the applicant attended the meeting and with the Chair's permission addressed the Panel, the points made are as below.

- The proposal would bring the property back into use
- It was set back
- The pre-existing boundary and hedges would remain
- The full elevation would not be noticeable
- The property sat on a street with a mixed street scene
- Was only marginally larger than the previous building
- In relation to the impact on residential amenity, the property was not visible on the street scene
- Boundaries – a tree planting scheme could be included

A Ward Councillor was also present and with the Chair's permission addressed the Panel and made the following points.

- The location was a unique part of the Ward with a variety of housing designs
- There was a problem with fly-tipping and ASB in the area
- the applicant had a growing family

Members were then given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments, the details of which are as below.

- Members expressed concern that the proposed design was not in keeping and was out of scale
- ASB was not a planning consideration
- A Member stated that it did not breach or conflict with policy
- If the existing building was demolished, it may be subject to enforcement action
- Nice design, neighbours had not objected
- Houses at the top of the same street were similar in scale
- Would the existing tree need to be removed? Officers advised that it would not need to be removed but would need protection
- Was the glass for the atrium dark or one-way? Officers advised it was not in the application but could be specified as a condition
- One Member did not agree regarding extra trees and stated that he did not think it was in conflict and wanted to approve the application

#### **Resolved –**

**That the application be approved subject to the conditions below: as Members considered that it does not conflict with policies DS1 and DS3 and is keeping with the street scene.**

- 1. That protective fencing be erected around a tree at the front of the property before work commences and throughout**
- 2. That materials including the glass to be used in the atrium, be approved in writing by Planning Officers before work commences**

**(C) Land 404492 438794 Goose Cote Lane Keighley West Yorkshire -  
22/03576/OUT**

**Worth Valley**

Outline planning application for residential development of land for up to 9 dwellings requesting consideration of access at land at 404492 438794 - south of Goose Cote Lane, Keighley.

**Resolved –**

**That the withdrawal of the application by the applicant prior to the meeting be noted.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**17. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

**Resolved:**

**That the decisions made by the Secretary of State as set out in (Document “E”) 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