

**Replacement  
Unitary Development Plan  
for the  
Bradford District**

**Inspector's Report**

**Keighley  
Constituency  
Volume**

# **Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District**

## **Inspector's Report**

### **Keighley Constituency Volume**

#### **Contents**

<b>Chapter number and title</b>	<b>Page number</b>
3 Principal Policies	1
4 Urban Renaissance	9
5 Economy and Employment	43
6 Housing	65
7 Centres	147
8 Transport and Movement	160
10 Built Heritage and the Historic Environment	171
11 Community Facilities	174
12 Open Land in Settlements	181
13 Green Belt	201
14 Natural Environment and Countryside	226
15 Natural Resources	228

## **Chapter 3            Principal Policies**

### **PARAGRAPH 3.0**

#### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- Silsden is a village, not a town, and does not have the infrastructure and services to support new development. Development allocations for Silsden are out of all proportion to the size of the settlement compared with larger urban areas. Silsden is well separated from the urban parts of the Airedale corridor between Keighley and Bradford.
- There is insufficient employment for the proposed new population. High levels of out-commuting would occur, resulting in more congestion down the Aire Valley.
- The needs of Keighley should be met elsewhere.
- Large areas of attractive agricultural land, crossed by recreational footpaths and harbouring wildlife, would be lost. Recycled land should be used instead, with the Green Belt enlarged to include the Silsden allocations.
- Flooding would increase.
- The character of Silsden as a community would suffer.
- Deleted housing allocations in the RDDP compared with the FDDP should be replaced in Addingham. The Silsden allocations are not viable.
- The Silsden housing allocations, and the proposed bypass, should be brought forward.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 3.1 This section of the report deals also with objections to the scale of allocations in Silsden made in the context of principal policies in the Policy Framework volume. The summary of objections set out above assembles general objections categorised by the Council under the specific site allocations listed later in this volume.
- 3.2 Section 3.0 of the constituency volume is concerned with the role of the area and the application of the location strategy to the constituency. Within this, Silsden (grouped with Steeton) is noted as the only area offering real potential for new housing and employment development during the plan period, being well-placed to meet the expanding needs of Upper Airedale for development. Silsden/Steeton retains a local industrial base but also constitutes an important commuter area.
- 3.3 I have already concluded that the plan's settlement hierarchy should accord with advice in regional guidance. The draft plan classifies Silsden as a town. To my mind, the settlement should not be so categorised, using the tests in RPG12.
- 3.4 The Council's proof on the role of Silsden recognises that the plan's definition of Silsden as an urban area departs from a strict interpretation of the hierarchy defined in RPG12. RPG says that, "in deciding which settlements should be categorised as market towns, the emphasis should be on locations which support sustainable development objectives, provide a good range of local services, and which are the most accessible in the area by a range of transport modes".

- 3.5 I consider accessibility first, and then services.

*The Accessibility of Silsden by a Range of Transport Modes*

- 3.6 Silsden itself has no railway station: the station which serves the settlement is situated on the northern edge of Steeton. The Council gives the distance of the station from the centre of Silsden as 1.8km. The proposed housing allocations would mostly be further from the station than that. The Council's sustainability appraisal uses a distance of 800 metres as the easy walking distance to a railway station. Steeton station is well beyond that distance.
- 3.7 For pedestrians and cyclists the station is difficult of access from Silsden. Access is by heavily used main road, Keighley Road, which has no footway on the eastern side as it crosses the River Aire. The proposed bypass would give the opportunity for better designed walkways and cycleways, but these would still be associated with a busy road. More importantly, pedestrians and cyclists have to cross the A650 to approach the station. From the evidence and from personal experience I can say that this is a most unpleasant experience, involving a feeling of exposure to danger from fast approaching vehicles using 3 lanes to enter the roundabout. The detrunking of the A650 might give the Council a greater opportunity of improving safety for cyclists and those on foot, but this is for the present a matter of speculation.
- 3.8 Overall, distance, unpleasantness, and a feeling of exposure to danger impede access to the station for walkers and cyclists. In my opinion feeder bus services from new housing areas and the proposed (but not yet certain) expansion of the overused car park at Steeton station are not substitutes for satisfactory facilities for walking and cycling. This reflects the importance attached to walking and cycling in national transport policy. Also, pedestrians and cyclists are placed first and second respectively in the Transport Hierarchy of the Council's Local Transport Plan. Another, less important, consideration is the permanence of the bus services, which would have to be subsidised. The profitability of the Otley-Menston service might not be duplicated at Silsden. Even if they survived, new feeder bus services would mitigate sustainability disadvantages but not remove them.
- 3.9 Silsden is not best placed in terms of rail transport. This disadvantage is not counterbalanced by especially good bus accessibility. There is no 10-minute frequency 'arrive and go' service to and from Silsden, such as the Council describes in its reference to quality bus corridors in paragraph 3.72 of the plan's Policy Framework volume. The addition of the Ilkley to Steeton bus link to the Quality Bus Network (plan proposal K/TM6.1) is described in the plan as "aspirational" and "long term". I do not give it significant weight in assessing the comparative accessibility of Silsden.
- 3.10 Silsden has good road communications, but is not one of the most accessible settlements in the area by a range of transport modes. There are several urban areas, and nodes in good quality public transport corridors, which have better public transport provision than Silsden.

*Local Services*

- 3.11 Silsden is at a lower level in the settlement hierarchy than towns like Bingley and Ilkley. It possesses fewer services and facilities, but to my mind it offers a range which includes

most of the services one would expect in a small town. It does, however, lack a secondary school and a large store.

- 3.12 The secondary school attended by most Silsden school students is at Cross Hills in Craven District, North Yorkshire. The nearest schools in Bradford District are in Keighley, a similar distance away. There are no plans to build a secondary school in Silsden.
- 3.13 There is what was described at the Inquiry as a limited bus service to the South Craven school from Silsden, for pupils up to 15 years of age. That school is 5.5 km from Silsden. In my opinion this distance must result in many parents driving their children to school, and large-scale housing development would increase the use of the private car in this way, despite the school bus provision.
- 3.14 The scale of proposed housing provision in Silsden and Steeton would result in a need to expand South Craven school. The North Yorkshire LEA objected to the draft plan on the basis of its effects on the education service. The Council says that, although the objection has not been withdrawn, the LEA and the school governors are not opposed to the expansion of South Craven school, for which land is available. However residents of Cross Hills are opposed to this course of action, because of the amount of traffic using apparently congested roads in Cross Hills.
- 3.15 The Council's evidence does not refer to expansion of schools in Bradford District to cater for the increased population of Silsden.
- 3.16 I conclude that the above deficiencies in the range of local services at Silsden tell against categorising the settlement as an urban area for the purposes of RPG. There is also some justification for objections based on the lack of infrastructure at Silsden.
- 3.17 Other alleged deficiencies are not matters of concern. There is public open space provision, and new developments of housing would be required to supply open space facilities to meet their own needs. This open space would be available for the existing residents too. Instead of causing more traffic congestion in the centre of Silsden, the package of development proposals would take through traffic out of the centre and onto the eastern bypass. The connection between new development and social problems is not proven.

#### *Supporting Sustainable Development Objectives*

- 3.18 The relative lack of accessibility by public transport, and the deficiencies in service provision, both militate against a conclusion that Silsden is a location which supports sustainable development objectives.
- 3.19 Additionally, although some employment is provided in businesses and other concerns in Silsden, the settlement is also a commuter settlement as the plan admits. Figures for Craven Ward, which includes Silsden, show that in 1991 only 26.1% of the ward's residents worked in the ward. The Council's own figures show that, even with the new employment, the scale of housing development proposed would increase the adverse balance between numbers of economically active residents on the one hand and jobs on the other.

- 3.20 Because of the specific deficiencies in facilities and employment, additional housing at Silsden on a large scale could be expected to increase the number of journeys to higher order centres and other destinations. Because of the public transport constraints discussed above, journeys from Silsden would tend to involve use of the private car. There would be less opportunity of using public transport than with development in other better placed settlements.
- 3.21 Furthermore, as Silsden is located on the western edge of Bradford District, journeys to some sources of employment and higher order centres would be relatively long distance. For example, Keighley is 18 km from Bradford, 7.7 km from Bingley, and 13 km from Shipley. Silsden is roughly another 6 km up the Aire Valley from Keighley. On a related matter, it is incongruous to be meeting the housing needs of the District, whose main population centre is considerably further south-east and much larger than Silsden, in a rather small settlement on the far edge of the District. Silsden would provide for about 1535 dwellings during the period to 2014, in the RDDP. This is about 5% of the total housing provision, whereas the settlement has only perhaps 1.5% of the District's population.
- 3.22 My overall conclusion is that Silsden does not meet the criteria for an urban area set out in RPG12. On this basis it should not be subject to the large-scale development allocations made in the RDDP. It is also significant that the allocations for housing, and much of the proposed employment land, are on greenfield sites. Although the land is not of particular agricultural value, it is part of the countryside surrounding Silsden, is valued for its own sake and for the sake of the wildlife which uses it, and has footpaths used for recreation. It shows the characteristics of greenfield land which underlie the national policy to use previously-developed land first. The town expansion scheme would represent a large scale erosion of the open countryside. The Council's landscape evidence regarding sites east and south-east of Silsden refers to the medium-high strength of the landscape, its visibility, and its high historical continuity. In my view much of this countryside is in good condition.
- 3.23 The housing allocations are in addition a major cause of the need for an eastern bypass for Silsden, with the landscape damage which that would incur (see below). The opportunity to replace the present weak urban edge with a clear boundary is not a weighty consideration in comparison with policy concerning the sequence of development. However, I go on to examine other possible considerations which the Council advances in favour of major allocations in Silsden, and which objectors raise against the expansion of the settlement.

#### *Other Considerations*

- 3.24 The Council maintains that Silsden expansion is needed to meet the expanding needs of Upper Airedale, given the topographical and environmental constraints on the growth of Keighley. This gives Silsden a unique position in the RDDP as an 'overspill' location. The Council argues against the assessment of supply on the basis of market areas, and I agree with this argument. As the Council says, an approach which divided the District into housing market areas, or by political constituency, could lead to unsustainable housing allocations, contrary to regional and national policy. In any case, I do make recommendations which would result in a net increase of 7.62 hectares in the amount of housing land allocated at Keighley itself. Keighley of course is an urban area, the second largest settlement in the District.

- 3.25 The expansion of Silsden would be a ‘package’ including both employment and housing development, together with a bypass and some new infrastructure provision such as a new primary school. However, the absence of the disadvantage of a large housing development without facilities is not a convincing argument in the light of the sustainability objections to a concentration of development at Silsden. The Council’s objective of achieving a balanced community is met by sustainable development associated with urban areas, where main services are concentrated. In addition a major housing allocation is made at Sty Lane nearer to the main urban area than Silsden is, but not too far from Keighley, and accessible by good public transport down valley. Another avenue, which the Council has not explored properly, is a full urban capacity study of upper Aire Valley settlements.
- 3.26 There would be some ‘betterment’ for the existing residents of Silsden, not least because the bypass would take through traffic out of the centre of Silsden. The Council refers to the fact that development would achieve a more defensible Green Belt boundary south and east of Silsden, in the form of the proposed bypass. These considerations are of less weight than compliance with RPG strategy.
- 3.27 As for other matters raised by some objectors, the majority of the allocations made in the plan are located away from the floodplain of the River Aire, and comfortably above the area where rapid changes in the ground water level would occur. The flooding of the allocated sites themselves is not a significant consideration in deciding on their future. Flooding downstream of Silsden, in Keighley, in autumn 2000, was the result of a breach in a flood wall. This has been repaired. The larger allocations in Silsden are of a scale and nature to allow for the development on them of sustainable urban drainage systems, such as soakaways and other infiltration systems in the form of wetlands or water bodies in recreation areas. These would hold water on site, after storms for example, and release it gradually at a rate which would not cause flooding downstream. Where necessary developers would be required to provide flood risk assessments. Permissible water discharge rates from the sites would have to be met.
- 3.28 The main trunk sewer in the relevant part of the Aire Valley is a combined system. Improvements to combined sewer overflows in the Silsden area are to be carried out. In comparison with the existing combined flows, the foul drainage from allocations in Silsden would add little.
- 3.29 Yorkshire Water and the Environment Agency have not objected to the expansion of Silsden. They would be involved in the more detailed work of assessing necessary site drainage measures, should the allocations progress. The Council’s expert evidence contrasts with the more generalised points made by lay objectors. I conclude that there is no overall drainage or flooding objection to the choice of Silsden for large-scale development.
- 3.30 Matters like amounts of parking per dwelling, and the design and layout of parking, access, and pedestrian routes, would all be given detailed attention if the principle of development was to be allowed. The consultations undertaken by the Council with local residents and other parties are a matter for the Council.

### *Employment Allocations*

- 3.31 I accept that the Keighley area is constrained in terms of land suitable for employment use, especially due to the extent of areas subject to potential flooding. Silsden offers one

- of the few places where significant areas of available land are less constrained in this way. However, the evidence to support the extent of the employment land allocations in Silsden is not compelling.
- 3.32 The basis of the forecast of total employment land requirement in the whole of the District is not rigorous, nor is there any evidence that the policies and allocations of neighbouring Plans have been taken into consideration. The recommendations I have made elsewhere in my report in relation to employment land allocations would result in an overall reduction of less than 5 hectares throughout the District. Thus the total area of land allocated for employment in the RDDP is essentially unchanged.
- 3.33 While the locational distribution would change, with the main losses being from Silsden, the additional sites recommended are more closely related to the main urban areas, centres of population and regional and national transport networks. Such additional sites more closely satisfy the criteria, aims and objectives of sustainable development - which is a fundamental policy basis of national and regional planning, and indeed the Replacement UDP. While sites in Silsden may be marketable to employers and developers, they are reliant to a significant degree on the use of private transport, especially for the potential workforce. Such sites fail to take account of the enhanced policy status of sustainable development and the reduction of dependence on private motor vehicles, as set out in PPG3 and PPG13.
- 3.34 Similarly, the extension of the Strategic Development Corridor to Silsden is acceptable in principle, but the quantity of land allocated in this location is disproportionate to the aims and objectives of national, regional and local policy emphasis on sustainable development. I consider that the large allocations in Silsden owe much more to previous planning goals than to those required for a sustainable future.
- 3.35 While there is evidence of significant demand for employment land in the Keighley area, many objectors have indicated that existing companies, and those seeking to locate in Keighley, do not consider that Silsden is an acceptable location. The Council has suggested that some 4 hectares should be deleted from the allocations at Keighley, which I do not accept. My recommendations include the retention of the whole of the allocated area and additional employment land at Beechcliffe (K/E1.18 - E1.21 and SOM/K/E1/352), plus SOM/K/E1/238 – all at Keighley and within the Strategic Development Corridor.
- 3.36 Deleting 2 of the Silsden sites would reduce the number of larger sites allocated for employment, but 2 of the additional sites that I recommend for employment use are comparable. SOM/BN/E1/199 comprises 12.09 ha. and SOM/BS/E1/346 is 6.38 ha. Both of these sites adjoin land allocated for employment in the RDDP and thus provide total developable areas in excess of the individual sites in Silsden. Thus, the number of large sites in the District will not be reduced. Furthermore, as I have indicated in my consideration of the objections to policy E2 in the Policy Framework volume of my report, there is no compelling basis for the threshold of 3 ha. to define either a large or a single user site. Either or both of the recommended additional sites could be subject to policy E2.
- 3.37 While my colleague who considered objections to the currently adopted UDP accepted the Silsden employment allocations, his recommendations were made on the basis of significantly different national, regional and local policy guidance. I consider that the policy basis has fundamentally changed and warrants a different conclusion. The



acceptance of such allocations in the Airedale Local Plan has even less relevance to current policy guidance.

### *The Role of Silsden*

- 3.38 It seems to me that the considerable developer interest in the town expansion scheme would not be present if the proposals were not viable. One developer in particular has made a major commitment to the project, involving substantial investment. The town expansion scheme in fact has a long history, stretching back to 1973. I must say that I have the greatest sympathy with those who have worked towards the realisation of the scheme in the belief that it was the solution to various problems. I give full weight to the need for consistency in decision-making, and to the resources of money, time and effort which have been invested in attempting to implement the expansion of Silsden. Nevertheless, there comes a time when the effects of more up to date policies have to supercede the intentions of outdated ones, even at a cost. Had the allocations at Silsden been permitted, say in the last few years, the replacement UDP would have carried this weight of unsustainable commitments. My recommendations are designed to improve the balance of the replacement UDP by the sustainable concentration of development on urban areas.
- 3.39 Silsden is not in my opinion a sustainable location for large-scale allocations for either housing or employment. Its choice for such allocations in the draft plan is contrary to national and regional policy. Rather than being brought forward, most of the allocations should be deleted, a matter I deal with in the site-specific sections below.
- 3.40 Bradford District includes some major urban areas but that fact in my view should not prevent some parts of the District from being regarded as rural areas. This north-western fringe of the District, within which Silsden is located, is one such area. RPG12 Policy P1 provides for small-scale housing growth in and around smaller towns where this is of a type which will contribute to meeting local needs. Policy H2 says that in rural areas the provision of housing should be to meet local needs and/or support local services. In the context of these policies Silsden should be seen as a small town in a rural area.
- 3.41 The Council and many objectors speak of a local need for housing to serve Silsden itself. The Council's evidence shows there to be such a need. In the year 2000 23.3% of Silsden housing was described as affordable, but the proportion of households with low incomes was 37%, indicating to the Council, and many other parties, a need for affordable housing. House price rises since 2000 have particularly affected the lower end of the market and decreased the proportion of affordable housing. Income levels have failed to keep pace with price rises. Over half of the original local authority housing stock has been sold. There is a high demand for sheltered housing.
- 3.42 Those parts of section 3.0 of the Keighley Proposals which are concerned with Silsden all refer to its suitability for growth. These references should be deleted and replaced with material which gives the settlement a more modest role meeting its own local needs, for reasons of sustainability.

### *Green Belt at Silsden*

- 3.43 Many of the objectors to the development proposals request that, where housing or employment allocations are deleted, the land be included in the Green Belt. A large area of land was removed from the Green Belt in the adopted UDP in order to provide for the

planned expansion of Silsden. Also, the location policies of the plan do not support major development in Silsden in the future. In my view the change in the role of Silsden from that envisaged in the adopted UDP could be an exceptional circumstance, which could justify an alteration to the boundary of the Green Belt. I therefore consider it appropriate to reassess the land no longer required for development in the context of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

- 3.44 Many of the sites are on the periphery of the settlement, and are open countryside, often indistinguishable from the Green Belt land beyond. I consider the specific allocations later in the report, but generally the inclusion of such land within the Green Belt would assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of development by restricting the further growth of Silsden, and preventing encroachment into the countryside.

### *Addingham*

- 3.45 I regard Addingham as being a large village within a rural area. It occupies an attractive location on the lower slopes of Rombalds Moor and is set within the Green Belt that tightly encompasses the built form. In terms of the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land set out in Policy H2 of RPG12, it comes at the bottom of the hierarchy; housing provision should be to meet local needs and/or support local services, giving priority to the re-use of previously-developed land or buildings and to conserving (and where possible enhancing) the character of the village. I have been presented with no substantive evidence on any specific local need or requirement for the support of services within Addingham to justify a large-scale allocation of housing land.
- 3.46 From what I have seen there is a range of services and facilities commensurate with Addingham's village status but I would expect that much reliance for employment and general needs will be met by the requirement for travel to higher-order settlements. In terms of its accessibility by a range of transport modes, Addingham has no railway station, the nearest being Ilkley, over 5 km from most of the village, and Silsden with Steeton, over 7km away. The level of bus service through Addingham to Ilkley, Silsden and beyond falls below that which the plan defines as good. Within the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan there are no proposals for specific improvements to public transport extending into Addingham. The Ilkley to Steeton bus link proposal (K/TM6.1), passing along the bypass, is, as already noted above, described as an aspirational long term addition to the Quality Bus Network. I therefore consider that in locational and sustainability terms the RDDP's emphasis on restraint on further development as far as Addingham is concerned is the correct one.
- 3.47 Even if the housing allocations were to be powered by market area needs and demands, Addingham would not, for the above reasons, be the settlement within which the needs of Keighley should be met.

### **Recommendation**

- 3.48 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting all references to Silsden in section 3.0 of the Keighley Proposals, and replacing them by a paragraph which sets out Silsden's existing role as a commuter settlement with some employment and services, its position in the RPG hierarchy, and its future role as a location for only limited development to meet local needs.**

## Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

### SOM/K/UR4/383 & SOM/K/H1/383: Land at Sykes Head, Oakworth, Keighley

#### Objector

4086/10932 & 11815 Mrs M Struthers

#### Summary of Objections

- The site should be shown on the Proposals Map as allocated for housing instead of being unallocated.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.1 The mapping convention of the RDDP is that sites of less than 0.4 hectares. are not shown on the Proposals Map. I accept that it is not possible to show every potential development site, and it seems to me that a threshold of 0.4 hectares is reasonable. The objection site is only about half this size and, therefore, is significantly smaller than could realistically be shown on the Proposals Map. In addition, many potential development sites of less than 0.4 ha. will not be known to the Council and, therefore, to include only some such sites would, in my view, result in even less clarity for users of the plan. Such small unidentified sites will often occur as "windfall sites", and the RDDP makes allowance for the development of such sites, where appropriate.
- 4.2 As unallocated land the site is covered by Policy UR4 of the RDDP, which provides for development of this type of land subject to certain conditions such as location and whether it is previously-developed land. Hence, the fact that a site is not identified for development does not necessarily prevent development from taking place.
- 4.3 I consider that the RDDP is correct in showing the site as unallocated.

#### Recommendation

- 4.4 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### K/UR5.1 & SOM/K/GB1/63: Parsons Lane, Addingham

#### Objectors

2705/7022	Mrs Elizabeth Jane Whiteside
2708/6995	Addingham Parish Council
3071/513	Mr David W Pratt
3475/4643	Mrs Penny Jerome
3478/4599	Mr Alan Jerome
3486/6593	Mrs Patricia Pearson
4377/7457 & 7458	Mr S Crossley-Smith
4465/9949	Drs Alexander & Joanna Geddes

## Summary of Objections

- The land should not be developed but should be included in the Green Belt.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.5 Addingham is in the lowest category in the plan's housing location strategy, where only small-scale housing provision will be made to serve local needs and help ensure the continuation of local services. The RDDP allocates one phase 2 housing site, which is a previously-developed site on the edge of the village, and there is one other area within the village which is shown as safeguarded land, which I consider later in this report. These sites are well located in relation to the village centre. They would appear adequate to satisfy local needs both during the plan period, and in the longer term. The Parsons Lane site is on the edge of Addingham, remote from shops and services, and would not be a sustainable location for new housing. In addition, the site is likely to suffer from noise from the A65, and thus may not provide a satisfactory residential environment.
- 4.6 I therefore consider that the land should not be safeguarded for future development. It is adjoined on three sides by proposed Green Belt, and inclusion of this site would contain the settlement, and prevent encroachment into the countryside. In this regard I have considered the justification for the large-scale extension of the Green Belt around the west and north of Addingham in relation to K/GB1.4 below.

## Recommendation

- 4.7 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.1 and the inclusion of the land within the Green Belt.**

**K/UR5.2 & SOM/K/H1/228: Lyon Road, Steeton with Eastburn**

## Objector

*3842/6866 & 10099 Taywood Homes Ltd*

## Summary of Objections

- The safeguarded land designation should be deleted and the land allocated as a phase 1 housing site.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.8 The objection land is a greenfield site within the built form of Eastburn. The RDDP classes Steeton with Eastburn as a smaller settlement in a good public transport corridor. However, in my opinion it is doubtful whether Eastburn should be classed with Steeton in respect of accessibility to the station at Steeton. This is situated an inconvenient walking distance from Eastburn, as are the other facilities of Steeton. Eastburn is separated from Steeton by Airedale Hospital, as far as day to day services are concerned. Nor does Eastburn have the level of services offered by other settlements which can be classed as nodes in good quality public transport corridors, such as Menston.

- 4.9 The RDDP's phase 1 housing requirement is largely met by estimated windfalls, sites with planning permission or no objections, and sites in more sustainable settlements. There is no requirement to allocate the land as a phase 1 housing site.
- 4.10 The site is broadly the same as that allocated for housing within the adopted UDP. Outline planning permission for residential development was granted in 1996 but has lapsed. This leads me to the view that any potential conflict with adjoining uses could be overcome as part of the development control process, with the use of appropriate conditions. From the evidence it appears that the site does not fall within the indicative flood plain. This is borne out by my observations that the site stands raised above land to the north, which is shown as being so affected.
- 4.11 I have concluded below that the adjoining site K/E1.1 should be deleted as an employment allocation, is not suitable for housing purposes because of its location within the floodplain, and should be allocated as safeguarded land. This therefore negates the argument that development of the present objection land would be beneficial in providing a more commodious access to allow development of the employment site.
- 4.12 In sustainability terms I consider the objection land to be only moderately placed, being about 2.5 km from Steeton station, having only very limited shops and facilities within ready walking distance, but fronting a road with an above-average frequency of bus service. In my view this is not sufficient to override the wider locational considerations above.
- 4.13 I have concluded in relation to the Policy Framework volume that only land between the urban area and the Green Belt should be designated as safeguarded land. I consider that the objection land is within rather than on the edge of Eastburn, with development to 2 of its 3 sides and the wide Main Road along the third. Only a very small section of the site would face land to the opposite side of Lyon Road (K/E1.1), which I am recommending should be allocated as safeguarded land. On balance, I consider that the safeguarded land allocation should be deleted and the land left without notation on the Proposals Map. Any future proposals on the site would then fall to be judged against the plan's other policies, including Policy UR4, which deals with development on unallocated sites. From these conclusions, it follows that I do not consider the site suitable for phase 2 housing either.

## **Recommendation**

- 4.14 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site's safeguarded land designation K/UR5.2.**

### **K/UR5.3: Sycamore Grove, Steeton with Eastburn (SOM/K/H1/42)**

#### **Objectors**

17/2146	<i>Mrs C E Parker</i>
713/2145	<i>Mr J Thompson</i>
1248/2144	<i>The Lloyd Family</i>
1382/2141	<i>Mr and Mrs P Lloyd</i>

### Summary of Objections

- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site rather than being safeguarded.
- The site is in a sustainable location and has no constraints to its development. Further housing will be needed as nearby employment areas and the Airedale Hospital expand.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.15 I have considered these objections in relation to SOM/K/H1/42 below, to which reference should be made.

### Recommendation

4.16 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/UR5.4, SOM/K/H1/234 & SOM/K/CF4/234: Main Road, Steeton with Eastburn**

#### Objectors

811/2140	<i>Mr D H Green</i>
834/2138	<i>Mr S Simpson</i>
2973/7866	<i>Mr David J A Thompson</i>
2982/6953	<i>Professor and Mrs C Husband</i>
3507/7179	<i>Miss Jeanne A Pakes</i>
3842/6699, 10110/11	<i>Taywood Homes Ltd</i>

### Summary of Objections

- There is no need for further housing, which if built would not be for locals but those who commute, there being no extra work in the village.
- The site is too far from Steeton station for people to walk.
- Development on the site would unacceptably connect Steeton with Eastburn.
- Development would result in additional traffic congestion.
- The safeguarded land allocation should be deleted and the land allocated for a phase 1 housing site.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.17 The objection land is shown as a housing site within the adopted UDP but is allocated as safeguarded land within the RDDP. I have considered the status of Steeton with Eastburn in relation to the RDDP and RPG12 Policy H2, together with phase 1 housing provision, in respect of K/UR5.2 above. The same overall conclusions regarding a sufficiency in the supply of phase 1 housing apply to this site.

4.18 In sustainability terms I consider the site is only moderately placed: it is within ready walking distance of regular and above-average frequency bus routes, but is about 1.75 km from Steeton station (although this would be slightly reduced if the proposed cycleway improvement under K/TM20 came to fruition). The range of shops and services within convenient walking distance is limited. In my view these characteristics do not override the sequential and locational considerations that lead me to conclude that there is no requirement to allocate the land as a phase 1 housing site.

- 4.19 It is argued by Taywood Homes Ltd that development of the site would result in significant community benefits and that these would count in favour of the site's allocation for housing. Development would provide an opportunity to improve safe access to Eastburn Junior and Infants School, and to provide facilities like better staff and visitor parking, formal outdoor sports facilities, and an emergency access to the hospital. There is no evidence that there is an immediate necessity for any of these improvements although the Council's Development Brief for the site, drawn up in 1999, clearly envisages access improvements for the school as an important element. There are constraints in width, layout, junction arrangements and partial absence of footpaths along parts of Green Lane and Lyon Road. I therefore accept that the potential access improvements in particular need to be weighed as advantages of early development of the objection land since no other mechanism for achieving these has been demonstrated.
- 4.20 Nevertheless, from the evidence presented I have seen nothing to suggest that problems occur because of the present absence of an emergency access to the hospital or that material harm arises from the current access and parking regime at the school. I note that there is an absence of expressed support for early development to alleviate any perceived problems from local residents, the education authority or other responsible bodies. It is apparent that there is a deficiency in sports pitch facilities and development could alleviate this. However, as I know from another objection, there are currently unused facilities a short distance away to the north of the hospital, which are protected within the RDDP under Policy OS3 (see SOM/K/GB1/43). It might be possible to investigate these for school use.
- 4.21 From the past history of the site I have no reason to doubt that it is genuinely capable of development. I have not seen any evidence to suggest that housing here would result in traffic congestion. Nor do I believe that development would unacceptably join Eastburn with Steeton in a visual sense, particularly as land between Main Road and the site will remain largely open in character through its designation as village greenspace.
- 4.22 Overall, I am not convinced that any of the benefits that might arise from housing development on the objection land are of such magnitude as to outweigh the wider locational considerations relating to the status of the land within the RDDP. As a consequence, I consider that no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

### **Recommendation**

- 4.23 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/UR5.6 & SOM/K/H1/64: Moss Carr Road, Long Lee, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

703/1704 & 6091 *Mr C R Sutcliffe*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be allocated for housing in the first phase of the plan rather than as safeguarded land under Policy UR5.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.24 The objection site comprises open land on the edge of the built-up area. It is a fairly exposed site in a prominent hillside location and is split into three levels, with an almost vertical rock face of a former quarry towards its southern edge. Planning permission for 10 dwellings on adjacent land was granted in 1995 but was not implemented and has now lapsed. The RDDP states that access to the development would be dependent on the resolution of highway constraints at Coney Lane Bridge.
- 4.25 These constraints also affect a number of former phase 2 housing sites in the vicinity (K/H2.12 - K/H2.17 inclusive) that have been removed from the RDDP. This, together with the advanced stage of development on the only phase 1 housing site in Long Lee (K/H1.23), is given as an argument for the allocation of the objection site for housing in phase 1 of the RDDP; without the re-allocation of the objection site there would be no housing sites for development in Long Lee until after 2014.
- 4.26 However, the services and facilities in the immediate area are limited and do not provide for the reasonable needs of local residents, although I note that there are bus routes along Long Lee Lane that are within 400 metres. No compelling evidence has been presented to demonstrate a need for housing in the vicinity in the immediate future.
- 4.27 The RDDP does not permanently delete the former phase 2 housing sites but re-allocates them as safeguarded land under Policy UR5 (K/UR5.17 - K/UR5.22 inclusive). I am recommending below that K/UR5.17 should be re-allocated as urban greenspace, and, because of its more sustainable characteristics, that UR5.22 should be allocated as a phase 2 housing site. Should this latter recommendation be accepted a housing site would be likely to be available within Long Lee prior to 2016, my recommended end-date for the plan. The other sites will be considered for development in the review of the plan. Furthermore, some are better related to the existing urban form and a wider range of local services and facilities than the objection site. The suggested resolution of the access constraints at Coney Lane Bridge would be equally beneficial to these other sites.
- 4.28 In the absence of any defined early local housing need, and as more sustainable sites are available, I do not consider that the re-allocation of the objection site is either justified or acceptable.

## **Recommendation**

- 4.29 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **K/UR5.8 & SOM/K/H1/65: Moorlands Avenue, Exley Head, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

26/1700	<i>Mrs Barbara Lambert</i>
1931/1689	<i>Mr J S Sheridan</i>
1952/1687	<i>Miss Ellen Driver</i>
2352/1696	<i>Mr Robin Holmes</i>
2627/5012	<i>C A Laycock</i>
4214/3003 & 6090	<i>Mr Charles Laycock</i>
4453/9948	<i>Mrs F B Smith</i>



## Summary of Objections

- Housing should not be built on the site as it will cause traffic problems on roads, which are not suitable, and ‘rat-running’.
- There is a lack of drainage; Oakworth Road floods.
- Schools are over-populated.
- Housing has been built at Wheathead Lane.
- Development would spoil views of the countryside and would involve building on Green Belt land.
- The land is a sustainable site, should continue to be allocated for housing for early release.
- The withdrawal of the long-established commitment to future housing use on the basis of untested criteria and the Council’s own interpretation of PPG3 is a breach of trust and, potentially, a denial of natural justice.

## Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.30 Having regard to the site’s possible allocation for housing, in terms of RPG12 Policy H2 the site would represent an extension to Keighley. It is therefore a relatively lowly one in the sequential approach.
- 4.31 The objection land is not particularly well located for easy walking to shops, services and primary schools. There is a long steep gradient to negotiate to and from Keighley, which I consider would be a further deterrent to walking and cycling. A 10-minute frequency bus service in Oakworth Road passes relatively close to the site but it is my view that in overall sustainability terms the site is not well placed. The Council’s previous commitment to residential development through the site’s allocation for housing within the adopted UDP is insufficient to override the wider sustainability considerations. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is sufficiency in the plan’s phase 1 housing supply made up from sites within the urban areas. I have, however, noted a shortfall in the phase 2 supply. Nevertheless, on the basis of present local, regional and national policy regarding the allocation of housing land I am of the view that the site should not be allocated for housing within the life of the plan.
- 4.32 The land is not subject to any intensive use and I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that residential development would have adverse effects on the local road or drainage infrastructure, or that there would be insufficient school capacity. The loss of private views is not a matter to be addressed by the planning system. I do not consider the fact that there has been recent housing development at Wheathead Lane has any bearing on how this site should be considered.
- 4.33 I consider it likely that the realistic means of vehicular access would be as shown in a 1991 Development Brief. This would be via sites K/UR5.27 and K/UR5.28, both of which I am recommending remain as safeguarded land. From the evidence of a committee report relating to a refused residential planning application on the site in 2000 an alternative vehicular access to Moorlands Avenue would be unacceptable. I have no reason to doubt this. Access through site K/UR5.29 to the south might be possible but this is allocated as safeguarded land and has not been subject to any duly made objection, so is likely to remain as such. Therefore this only serves to reinforce my conclusion that, whilst the site might eventually be genuinely capable of development, its correct allocation within the plan is as safeguarded land. This is despite the acknowledged shortfall in phase 2 housing provision.

## **Recommendation**

4.34 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/UR5.9 & SOM/K/H1/66: Keighley Road (North), Bogthorn, Keighley**

#### **Objectors**

4203/3025 & 6089 *Mr & Mrs D & K S Wallbank*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site is predominantly brownfield, is in a sustainable location and should be allocated as a phase 2 housing site rather than as safeguarded land.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.35 The objection land lies at the south-western edge of Keighley and comprises part of the former Bogthorn Quarry, 3 detached dwellings and Higher Spring Head Farm. The site has been allocated as safeguarded land in both the FDDP and the RDDP, but was shown as a constrained housing site within the adopted UDP. The constraint to its development was seen as an unsatisfactory access, which is along an unmade track leading steeply up from Keighley Road. It is one of 7 safeguarded land sites situated to the western side of Keighley/Oakworth Road within this part of Keighley
- 4.36 I have noted in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is a shortfall in phase 2 housing provision. Having regard to the site's possible allocation for housing the site would represent an extension to Keighley. In terms of Policy H2 of RPG12 the site is relatively lowly in the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land, falling within the fourth of 5 categories. Within this category, as within the search sequence advocated by PPG3, priority is to be given to the use of previously-developed sites and conversions before greenfield sites.
- 4.37 It has been argued that the quarry site should be regarded as previously-developed land in terms of the PPG3 definition. This is on the basis that this includes land used for mineral extraction and waste disposal where provision for restoration has not been made through development control procedures. However, from the evidence presented it appears that a conditional 5-year planning permission was granted for landfilling the existing disused quarry in 1988. For the objectors it is claimed that no restoration ever took place. Irrespective of whether restoration has taken place it is my view that the former quarry site, parts of which are now used for storage, has undergone a large measure of natural regeneration and has blended into the landscape. This is despite the fact that the quarry face is still evident. As such, this would in itself take the quarry site out of the PPG3 definition of 'previously-developed land'. At best, therefore, the site can be described as partly greenfield and partly brownfield.
- 4.38 The site is not particularly well located in relation to shops, services and primary schools, the nearest being about 1.4 km away in Oakworth. The centre of Keighley is even further away, involving the negotiation of a long steep gradient, which I consider would be a deterrent to walking and cycling. However, a high-frequency bus service in Keighley

Road passes relatively close to the site. I conclude that in overall sustainability terms the site is not well placed.

- 4.39 I consider the present access would not satisfactorily cater for residential development, particularly because of its width and junction characteristics with Keighley Road. The only realistic means of achieving adequate access would be for the site to be developed in conjunction with the adjacent safeguarded land to the east, site K/UR5.29. There are no duly made objections to this allocation and the site is therefore unlikely to be developed until beyond the end of the plan period. It is also apparent that waste tipping took place within the quarry prior to the 1988 planning permission. Some of the waste may have been biodegradable. There is therefore a possibility of landfill gas generation from the site and this would need to be investigated prior to any development. Subject to resolution of these matters I have been presented with no evidence to suggest that the site would not be genuinely capable of future development or that it does not satisfy the PPG2 definition of safeguarded land. Nevertheless, these constraints lend weight to my overall view that, in locational and sustainability terms, the site should not be allocated for housing purposes within the RDDP, despite the acknowledged shortfall in phase 2 provision.

### **Recommendation**

- 4.40 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/UR5.10 & SOM/K/H1/67: Keighley Road (South), Bogthorn, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

4203/3022 & 6088 *Mr & Mrs D & K S Wallbank*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site is in a sustainable location and should be a designated phase 2 housing site rather than safeguarded land.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.41 The objection land comprises a sloping open field lying between existing residential development fronting Keighley Road and site K/UR5.9, described above. It has been allocated as safeguarded land in both the FDDP and the RDDP. Being immediately adjacent to the latter site I consider that the same locational and sustainability arguments discussed in relation to that site are equally applicable to this. Furthermore, as access to the site is along the same track leading to K/UR5.9, there would be reliance on development on the other safeguarded land site, K/UR5.29, to facilitate a satisfactory means of vehicular access to it. With this proviso, and providing investigation of any gassing from the landfill site within the quarry was investigated and if necessary remediated, I have seen nothing to suggest that the site would not be genuinely capable of development in the future. Nor is there anything to suggest that it does not satisfy the PPG2 criteria for safeguarded land. Given the above, my overall conclusion is the same as for site K/UR5.9, namely that the objection land should remain as safeguarded land and should not be allocated for housing within the RDDP.

## **Recommendation**

4.42 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/UR5.11 & SOM/K/H1/236: Keighley Road (West), Bogthorn, Keighley**

### **Objector**

*4201/7023 & 10113 Exors of Margaret Leslie Laycock*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The site is in a sustainable location and should be a designated phase 2 housing site rather than safeguarded land.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.43 In broad terms being adjacent to sites K/UR5.9 and K/UR5.10 the same locational and sustainability arguments as discussed above in relation to those sites are applicable to this. Access to the site could be taken via the above 2 sites and K/UR5.29. Alternatively, vehicular access might be possible from Thornhill Avenue, although this would require third party land.

4.44 As with sites K/UR5.9 and K/UR5.10 investigation and possible remediation of landfill gas from the tipped Bogthorn Quarry would be likely to be necessary before any development could take place on the site. With these provisos I have seen nothing to suggest that the site would not be genuinely capable of development in the future or that it does not satisfy the PPG2 criteria for safeguarded land. My overall conclusion is the same as for sites K/UR5.9 and K/UR5.10, namely that the objection site should remain as safeguarded land and should not be allocated for housing within the RDDP.

## **Recommendation**

4.45 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/UR5.12 & SOM/K/H1/68: Baden Street, Haworth (SOM/K/GB1/68)**

### **Objectors**

*3910/6569 Miss Helen E Ferguson*  
*4294/4917 & 5797 Green Emmott Trust*  
*4355/9899 Mrs Jane Sutcliffe*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be allocated for housing, preferably in phase 1.
- The site is a haven for wildlife and is an ideal place to develop sympathetically into a wild nature reserve. The site should also be designated as Green Belt.
- Access to the site is narrow with on-street parking.

- If the local economy is to continue to thrive there should be a refusal of all development proposals as all recent development is unsuited to the area.
- Noise of building work would be detrimental to health.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.46 On behalf of the Green Emmott Trust, one of the objectors, it is argued that at least part of the site should be regarded as previously-developed land. Former uses have included a quarry, a nursery/market garden and piggery. There is evidence of fly tipping and there is an area of hard surfacing that is apparently used as informal car parking. Nevertheless, from my site visit, and having regard to the PPG3 Annex C definition of previously-developed land, I have no reason to disagree with the conclusion of the Inspector who dismissed an appeal against refusal of an outline residential planning application in February 2003. He considered that the land should be classified as greenfield.
- 4.47 I have considered the overall case for the allocation of land to meet housing needs, in the Policy Framework volume of this report. In this I have concluded that there is an adequacy of supply in phase 1 made up from sites within the urban areas. Haworth is not part of the urban area and is classified as a less well located settlement within the RDDP. I have been presented with no substantive evidence that additional housing is needed to satisfy a proven local housing need there. This site comes very low down in the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land. Therefore, even if there were to have been a shortage of phase 1 land this site would be low in the order of search for additional sites to make this up.
- 4.48 As I am recommending that the Weavers Hill site is included within the Green Belt, it is unhelpful to make comparative judgements between this and the present objection land. On the other hand, areas of safeguarded land between settlements and the Green Belt boundary are necessary to cater for longer-term development beyond the plan period to ensure that the Green Belt boundary is an enduring one. Despite the narrowness of Baden Street I have no reason to consider that there are any fundamental constraints to limited residential development in the future. Matters of design and layout of any development and how this fitted into the fabric of Haworth would be matters of detailed planning control. Any construction work, which may involve some disturbance for local residents, would be likely to be short-lived.
- 4.49 I have also considered the site's location in relation to shops, services and means of public transport. The site lies outside the walking distance thresholds to shops and services applied within the RDDP. Although it is argued that these should not be applied in a prescriptive manner I consider that it is reasonable to apply them consistently in order to be able to make meaningful comparisons between sites. In any event, it is sensible in my view to consider the nature of walking routes rather than simple distances. There are steep walks along both the route to Mill Hey, with a steep and narrow section of Ebor Lane where there is no footway, and along Mytholmes Lane to the centre of Haworth. I agree with the Inspector who dealt with the February 2003 appeal that these journeys would not be convenient in terms of time and nature of the routes involved, and that along Mytholmes Lane to the centre of Haworth would deter all but the fittest.
- 4.50 Only 2, hourly, bus services pass close to the site along Mytholmes Lane. Although there are additional services running from Mill Hey this would involve a walk of about 600 metres along the route already described. It is claimed that the granting of planning permission for the residential conversion of Springhead Mills to the north-west

demonstrates that the Council has applied sustainability criteria in an inconsistent manner. However, I consider that the UDP process is not the correct mechanism for re-examining previous planning decisions. The important matter is for the UDP process to be applied on a consistent basis. In overall terms I do not consider the site to be well placed to benefit from methods of travel other than the private car.

- 4.51 Despite my conclusions within the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is a shortfall in the plan's phase 2 provision, the above locational and sustainability conclusions lead me to the view that this is not a site that should be considered a possibility to rectify the shortfall.
- 4.52 I have seen no evidence to support the contention that the site is important for its wildlife although I have no doubt that given the large amount of tree cover the site could well sustain wildlife. As safeguarded land this habitat is likely to remain for many years. Even if development was to take place in the future, the sloping nature of the site and the presence of a woodland Tree Preservation Order would also be likely to restrict the scale of residential development, ensuring that a substantial portion of the present habitat remained. I consider the present Green Belt boundary around 3 sides of the site to be robust and I see no reason why this should be changed to incorporate the land within the Green Belt.
- 4.53 It is my overall conclusion that to allocate this site for residential development would be contrary to national, regional and local policy in terms of concentrating development in the urban areas. I consider that no modification to the RDDP is justified.

## Recommendation

- 4.54 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **K/UR5.13, SOM/K/H2/69 & SOM/K/GB1/69: Denholme Road, Oxenhope**

### Objectors

253/1683 & 6085      *Mr E Breare*  
1459/3256 & 6057      *English Heritage*  
3283/7560 & 7561      *Mr Lee Angus*  
3285/7563 & 7564      *Mrs Stephanie Angus*

### Summary of Objections

- The site should be allocated as a phase 2 housing site as there are no physical, infrastructural or environmental constraints to development. Housing would support essential community facilities and services.
- Loss of the site to development would be of significant detriment to this part of Oxenhope and the safeguarded land allocation should be deleted in favour of a Green Belt notation.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.55 This single pasture field was allocated as a housing site within the adopted UDP but has been allocated as safeguarded land in both the FDDP and the RDDP. The site has never

been included within the Green Belt. In terms of the RDDP Oxenhope is a less well located settlement. Within the sequential approach to housing allocations set out in RPG Policy H2 it is at the bottom of the hierarchy, in a rural area. Although one objector has claimed that housing would help sustain essential community facilities and services I have seen no substantive evidence to support this contention or that there is a proven local need for housing.

- 4.56 Having regard to sustainability characteristics, I consider the site performs poorly. Although there are infrequent weekday buses passing the site the nearest more regular bus service is about 500 metres away in Lowertown, access to which involves negotiating a steep gradient along a road where for substantial lengths footpaths are absent. The site is well over 1 km from Oxenhope station on the Worth Valley line, which is in any case not part of the national rail network. The nearest primary school, shops and limited services are not within an easy walk, and there are few main sources of local employment. Furthermore, the site is greenfield and not previously-developed and, as discussed below, in my view makes a valuable contribution to the character of this part of Oxenhope in its present state. I do not consider that as a housing site it would accord well with PPG3 advice. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that within the district as a whole there is a shortfall in phase 2 housing supply. Nevertheless, because of its locational and sustainability characteristics I do not consider it would be appropriate to allocate the site for housing in order to address this.
- 4.57 The objection land is within the extensive Leeming Conservation Area in respect of which the Council's Conservation Area Statement notes that open spaces are particularly characteristic as a setting to the buildings. I beg to differ from the Inspector at the previous UDP in his conclusion that the site has little intrinsic aesthetic value and does not make a positive contribution to the conservation area. On the contrary, I consider that in its own right it does contribute both to the appearance and character of the area: it provides a break in development, bringing the countryside setting right up to the roadside, reinforcing the rural nature of the settlement, and affording views of the rising hillside backdrop and over the valley to the north-west. In combination with other open spaces it contributes to the overall impression of a settlement in which open spaces predominate.
- 4.58 Being within the conservation area it is true that the Council would have a strong battery of guidance and policy to help ensure any built development was of high quality design, should it be deemed necessary to develop on the land in the future. However, the size and shape of the field would indicate the likelihood of development in depth, which I consider would be at odds with the existing primarily linear development of the village. Furthermore, I agree with English Heritage that this somewhat misses the point in that it is the undeveloped nature of the site that provides its important contribution to the character of the conservation area.
- 4.59 In my view the objection land warrants a degree of protection greater than that which would be temporarily granted to it through safeguarding. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is an insufficiency of safeguarded land to cater for development needs beyond the plan period and to ensure that the Green Belt boundaries endure. With the objection land's present designation this would therefore contribute to what limited supply there is within the RDDP. Nevertheless, at less than 1 ha in extent the site is small, and would make only a small contribution to the overall supply of safeguarded land. I have also recommended a full-scale review of the Green Belt to ensure that sufficient safeguarded land is found to provide for long-term

development. Within this context it is my view that the removal of the safeguarded allocation is reasonable.

4.60 I have considered whether it would be appropriate to extend the Green Belt designation to the objection land. However, I do agree with the previous Inspector in his assessment that the site is an integral part of the settlement and it would not be appropriate to include it within the Green Belt. The present Green Belt boundary running along the stone wall to the rear of the land is clear and robust and I am not convinced that the site's inclusion would materially fulfil any of the purposes of the Green Belt. I consider that a more appropriate designation to afford the land protection would be that of village greenspace, to which Policy OS7 applies. Although there is no public access over the land it is very prominent within the settlement and, as discussed, important for its amenity value in terms of setting and character. Other land has been so designated both within and immediately adjacent to the conservation area and I consider the contribution of the objection land to be no less valuable.

4.61 I have therefore reached the overall conclusion that the safeguarded land allocation should be deleted and should be substituted by a village greenspace designation.

### **Recommendation**

4.62 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.13 and its replacement by the village greenspace notation.**

**K/UR5.14, SOM/K/UR5/24, SOM/OS2/24 & SOM/K/GB1/24: Woodside Road, Silsden (formerly H2.2)**

### **Objector**

3923/12109 *Mr Maurice Jackson Snr*

*Objections to the former allocation of the land for housing are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be retained as a housing allocation.
- The housing allocation should be deleted.
- The land should be included in the Green Belt or as safeguarded land.
- Retain the site as amenity land. There is a shortage of recreation land.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.63 There were a considerable number of objections to the allocation of the site for housing, and similar considerations apply to its designation as safeguarded land, since this implies that the site is suitable for development in the future. In considering the housing provision for the district as a whole, I have concluded that Silsden is not a suitable location for major new housing development, and am recommending the deletion of the allocated sites.

4.64 This site comprises open farmland on the outskirts of the settlement and is remote from shops and other facilities in the centre of Silsden. In my view it is an unsustainable



location, and the size of the site far exceeds what is likely to be required to satisfy the local needs of Silsden. I recommend the allocation of other sites for local needs housing, in the area of mixed previously developed and unkempt open land south of the Leeds-Liverpool canal. In these circumstances, it would be inappropriate to allocate this site for housing.

- 4.65 Other points are raised on behalf of Mr Jackson. Housing demolition and replacement are taken into account in the regional guidance calculations of the housing requirement, and I comment further in my overall consideration of strategic matters. Similar comments apply to the question of out migration from the District.
- 4.66 The site was allocated as a constrained site within the adopted UDP, partially on the basis that the Elliot Street/Kirkgate/Clog Bridge junction was considered to have inadequate capacity. Since the UDP's adoption, studies on behalf of one of the objectors have indicated that traffic likely to be generated by residential development on this Woodside Road site would result in less than 2% additional traffic at the junction and that the junction's performance would not be significantly affected. Nevertheless, this traffic would exacerbate conditions at the junction. RDDP Policy K/TM20.3 protects land for an improvement scheme at this junction and Mr Jackson is willing to contribute to improvements. Despite visibility and other constraints, the junction does not give rise to an untoward number of injury accidents. I therefore do not consider that, in their own right, junction problems would amount to a substantive reason for not allocating the objection land for housing.
- 4.67 I do not conclude that the land should be allocated for recreational use, as neither the Council nor any other body has plans to buy or prepare the land for this purpose. However, this is a prominent site, sloping down to the canal and exposed to views from the south. It is part of the open countryside that surrounds Silsden, and is similar in character to the land to the south of the canal, which is within the Green Belt. In present circumstances, where national and regional policy differs from the policies underlying the previous Inspector's report, I give greater weight to the characteristics of the site, described above, than to the visibility of housing north of the site and the proximity of urban fringe uses.
- 4.68 I consider the general extent of the Green Belt around Silsden elsewhere in this report, and I conclude in the Policy Framework volume that there are exceptional circumstances which justify altering the boundary of the Green Belt. The inclusion of this land within the Green Belt would check the unrestricted sprawl of the settlement, and assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Green Belt boundary would follow rear garden boundaries of the residential properties on Woodside Road, excluding the two small areas of land between houses fronting onto Woodside Road. Green Belt designation is more appropriate than designation as urban greenspace, because the land fulfills Green Belt purposes and does not lie within the built up area of the settlement.

## **Recommendation**

- 4.69 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.14 and that the land be included within the Green Belt with the exception of the two areas of land fronting onto Woodside Road.**

## **K/UR5.15 (formerly K/H2.3): North Dene Road, Silsden (SOM/K/GB1/25)**

### **Objectors**

*Objections to the former allocation of the land for housing are listed under reference H2.3 below.*

### **Summary of the Objections**

- The housing allocation should be deleted and the land should be included in the Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.70 All of the objections relate to the former allocation of the land for housing, and most are concerned with the scale of development proposed in Silsden as a whole, which I have considered earlier in this report. Although some of the original objections were withdrawn when the housing allocation was deleted, a number remain, and similar considerations apply to the designation as safeguarded land, since this implies that the site is suitable for development in the future. I am therefore considering the objections in relation to the current designation.

4.71 This site is located to the north of Silsden and is bounded on the south and east by existing housing, whilst land to the north and west is within the Green Belt. The land is largely screened from the north by trees and hedges. This, together with the rising land beyond, means that the site relates more to the settlement than to the open countryside. I therefore consider it is appropriate that it remains outside the Green Belt.

4.72 Whilst I agree with the Council that this site should not be developed within the plan period, there may be a need for further housing in the future, and I see no reason why any existing problems relating to access, drainage or other deficiencies should not be resolved to enable development to take place in the longer term.

### **Recommendation**

4.73 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **K/UR5.16 (formerly K/H2.10), SOM/K/H2/31 & SOM/OS7/31: Wharfe Park, Addingham**

### **Objectors**

2241/2003 & 2664	<i>Mr Benstead</i>
2705/9855 & 9857	<i>Mrs Elizabeth Jane Whiteside</i>
3278/7948	<i>Mrs B Goodwin</i>
3475/4597 & 4598	<i>Mrs Penny Jerome</i>
3478/4600 & 4602	<i>Mr Alan Jerome</i>
3486/6594 & 6595	<i>Mrs Patricia Pearson</i>
4377/11015	<i>Mr S Crossley-Smith</i>
4261/7524, 12104 & 12594	<i>Central and Provincial Properties Ltd</i>
3549/12560	<i>The Environment Agency-Development Planning</i>

## Summary of Objections

- The village has had enough building, and access is poor.
- The site is within the indicative flood risk area and there has been no flood risk assessment.
- The land should be left open or designated as village greenspace.
- The site should remain as a housing allocation and be brought forward to phase 1, as it is appropriate to make provision for some growth at Addingham.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.74 This was a phase 2 housing allocation in the FDDP, and the majority of the objections relate to this. However, the objections have not been withdrawn, and similar considerations apply to the designation as safeguarded land. I am therefore considering them as being in respect of the current safeguarded land allocation.
- 4.75 This is undeveloped land within the built-up area of Addingham, and hence is not appropriate for designation as safeguarded land under Policy UR5, as I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report. Also, Addingham is in the lowest category in the plan's housing location strategy, where only small-scale housing provision will be made to serve local needs and help ensure the continuation of local services in villages. The RDDP allocates one phase 2 housing site, which is previously-developed land on the edge of the village. In my view that site should be sufficient to cater for local needs, in accordance with the locational strategy of the plan. However, the objection land is well located in relation to shops and other village services, including a primary school, and there was considerable local support for the housing allocation, as well as the objections listed above. It would therefore be a suitable site for housing if a need arose in the longer term.
- 4.76 The site is close to Town Beck, and within the indicative flood plain. A flood risk assessment would therefore be required before the site could be developed, but I think it unlikely that this would preclude built development, although it might restrict its form.
- 4.77 There is an area of village greenspace centred around Town Beck abutting the objection land's southern boundary. However, I do not consider it would be appropriate to extend this allocation to the objection land. Being an open, rough grassed field the objection land is distinct from that to the south. The land is not prominent within the village, being largely enclosed by existing residential development, especially to the west, north and east from where there are limited public views across it. There is no public access and it therefore has no recreational value. In my view, the land has little amenity value in its own right and does not contribute in any material way to the character or setting of the village. I therefore consider the land's protection under Policy OS7 is not warranted.

## Recommendation

- 4.78 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.16.**

### **K/UR5.19: Moss Carr Road, Long Lee, Keighley (K/H2.14)**

#### **Objector**

3839/12110

*Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The site is a suitable housing allocation that should be retained as a phase 2 allocation or be brought forward to phase 1.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.79 I have considered this objection in relation to those made in respect of K/H2.14 below, which also relate to the site and in respect of which reference should be made.

#### **Recommendation**

4.80 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/UR5.22: Park Lane, Parkwood, Keighley (K/H2.17 and SOM/K/H1/420)**

#### **Objector**

3839/12111

*Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The land does not meet the requirements for safeguarded land as defined in PPG2.
- It is suitable for housing development and should be allocated as a phase 1 site or retained as a phase 2 allocation.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.81 The objection land was allocated as a phase 2 housing site in the FDDP but was changed to safeguarded land within the RDDP. The land is pasture and is an urban greenfield site lying within the built form of Keighley. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report in relation to Policy UR5 that only land between the urban area and the Green Belt should be designated as safeguarded land.

4.82 The site is close to a reasonable bus service with a 15-minute frequency. Keighley town centre with its range of shops, services and facilities is about 1.5 km away, as is Keighley rail station, but access to these involves the negotiation of a steep hill which I consider may deter walking and cycling. There are no significant shops and services within Long Lee but there is a primary school which is about 0.5km from the nearest part of the site. I do not consider the site performs as strongly in overall sustainability terms as other urban greenfield sites that I have examined, such as some for example in Ilkley and Queensbury, and which I am recommending should be phase 1 allocations. As a consequence, I do not agree with the objector that the site should be a phase 1 housing allocation.

- 4.83 I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of my report that, contrary to the Council's assessment, there is a shortfall in housing provision within phase 2. The objection land falls within the second of the 5 categories in the hierarchical sequential approach to housing land allocation of RPG Policy H2.
- 4.84 One reason for the Council changing the allocation of this site to safeguarded land, (together with that of 5 other previously allocated housing sites in Long Lee), was the perceived highway capacity limitations of and close to Coney Lane Bridge. There are plans for a one-way system near the bridge, although these are at a preliminary stage. The Council indicates that improvements would be carried out as part of the town centre Worth Way/East Parade link scheme (K/TM20.2). On the other hand, the objector points to alternative proposals involving signalling, traffic calming and pedestrian improvement measures that have been suggested to overcome current problems.
- 4.85 Figures have also been produced suggesting that traffic flows using Coney Lane Bridge as a result of the likely level of development on the site would increase by some 2.5% during the morning peak and some 5.0% during the evening peak. I consider the evidence of traffic flows on which this assessment is based to be somewhat sketchy, the existing flows over the bridge being surveyed at the peak periods on a single day in 1999. (I would also add that I have concerns about the way in which traffic flows appear to have been assigned in the objector's evidence since the greater flows do not seem to correspond with the predominant existing tidal flows in Long Lee). Whilst I have some doubts over the robustness of the data, the Council acknowledges that the development of the site itself would have limited impact on highway conditions in the vicinity of the bridge.
- 4.86 Nevertheless, its concern stems from the potential cumulative impact from development of the several possible housing sites within Long Lee. However, of these various sites I am recommending that K/UR5.19 and K/UR5.6 remain as safeguarded land. There are no duly made objections to the safeguarding of K/UR5.18, K/UR5.20 and K/UR5.21 (although in view of my recommendations about not safeguarding land within urban areas the Council may wish to consider de-allocating this latter site). I have also recommended that K/UR5.17 be added to the urban greenspace. Therefore, there would only be the objection land, K/H2.39 and, if my recommendation is accepted, the former Parkwood allotments, which would be housing allocations where development has yet to start and which could lead to increased traffic flows at the bridge during the plan period.
- 4.87 Having regard to the timing of any possible improvements to the bridge, the highway scheme K/TM20.2 is a plan proposal, with which the Council indicates such improvements may be linked. Whilst no indication of timing for these improvements is provided, given its inclusion in the plan I assume that this is a scheme that is likely to come to fruition during its lifetime. I do not consider therefore that, in itself, any constraint at Coney Lane Bridge would be sufficient to prevent the objection land becoming a phase 2 site to help meet the deficit in provision that I have identified. As I am not aware of any other constraints that would serve to delay development I am of the view that the RDDP should be modified by the re-allocation of the objection land as a phase 2 housing site.

## **Recommendation**

- 4.88 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.22 and its replacement as a phase 2 housing allocation.**

**K/UR5.23 (formerly K/H2.19), SOM/K/UR5/32 & SOM/K/GB1/32: Hainworth Wood Road, Woodhouse, Keighley**

**Objectors**

4993/12608-10            *West Yorkshire Ecology*  
2634/2698                *Mrs Patricia M Preshaw*  
2637/2696                *Dr John M Preshaw*

**Summary of Objections**

- The site is of considerable ecological interest and should be protected.
- Object to loss of Green Belt, and to increased traffic and sewage.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.89 This site adjoins the urban area of Keighley. It has never been included within the Green Belt and PPG2 advises that once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved its boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. This is an appropriate location for housing, in accordance with the locational strategy of the plan, and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify including it within the Green Belt.

4.90 However, it is an area of semi-improved grassland, surrounded on all but the highway boundary by woodland, and the Council acknowledges that it is of ecological interest. This is one of the reasons for the re-designation from a phase 2 housing allocation to safeguarded land, which would allow for a full assessment of its wildlife value, and to weigh this against the need for development. In my view this is an appropriate designation.

**Recommendation**

4.91 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/UR5.24: Hollins Lane, Utley, Keighley (K/H2.21, SOM/K/GB1/34, SOM/K/H1/34)**

**Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

**Summary of Objections**

- The site is too near a road junction, and the road network and drainage/sewerage systems are inadequate, especially Hollins Lane where volumes of traffic would increase.
- Brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield ones.
- The topography of the site with its steep gradients and the presence of a water main across it make the site an effective point to establish the Green Belt.
- The land should be designated as Green Belt to preserve the meadow, prevent urban sprawl, obviate further Green Belt changes to the west and provide a firm boundary.
- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site. Site circumstances have not changed since it was allocated as a housing site in the adopted UDP.

- Infrastructure improvements associated with the site's development would benefit the area in general. Safeguarding would reduce the likelihood of these taking place.
- The steepness of the site would make it difficult to achieve acceptable road gradients.
- There would be an adverse impact on biodiversity, protected trees, residential amenity and the adjacent Grade II listed building and its important garden.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.92 Within the FDDP the site was allocated as a phase 2 housing site (K/H2.21). This was changed to a safeguarded land allocation within the RDDP on the basis of the Council's reassessment of an adequacy of housing land supply during the plan period and the site's comparatively poor sustainability appraisal. So far as the allocation of the land as a phase 1 site is concerned, it is a greenfield one and development on it would represent an extension to Keighley, which in terms of Policy H2 of RPG12 is recognised as an example of a market town. Within this policy's sequential approach to housing land allocations the site comes low down the hierarchy.
- 4.93 I have already concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is a sufficiency of supply made up from sites higher up the search sequence and there is therefore no requirement for this site to be a phase 1 allocation. The emergence of current guidance in RPG12 and PPG3 represent significant policy changes since the earlier granting of planning permission on the site frontage and the allocation of the site for housing in the adopted UDP. In sustainability terms I do not consider the site to be well placed, as it is remote from primary schools, a good range of shops and services in the town centre, and frequent public transport. This being the case, I do not consider there is a strong argument for considering the land's allocation as a phase 2 site, even though there is an identified shortfall in overall housing provision within this phase.
- 4.94 The Council has reviewed the Green Belt boundary and has made changes to it within the vicinity of the site so that it follows more robust boundaries. These changes do not affect this site, which was not designated as Green Belt within the adopted UDP. The main characteristic of the Green Belt is its openness. Whilst the fields making up this site represent part of the attractive countryside setting for this part of Keighley its essential character is not one of openness. It is a relatively narrow tranche of land enclosed on 3 sides by existing development. It is only towards the crest of the slope near Four Oaks Cottage, and where the Council has chosen to define the Green Belt boundary, that the landscape is more expansive, opening up to the west. When seen from viewpoints within the Aire valley the enclosure of the site by surrounding development and trees is clearly evident. As such, I do not consider that the land would materially contribute to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and it would not be appropriate to extend this designation to it.
- 4.95 There is a need to safeguard a certain amount of land between the urban edge and the Green Belt to cater for development needs beyond the plan period and to ensure that the Green Belt boundary endures. This safeguarded land should be genuinely capable of development. Numerous concerns have been expressed about the practicalities of development on the site, including the formation of satisfactory access both to and within the site, and the implications of additional traffic on road safety. These are detailed matters that would require assessment within the context of a specific planning application. Nevertheless, from the evidence presented I am satisfied that an acceptable means of access could be formed. Development on the site would not result in an over-burdening of the local road system or result in material highway danger. Similarly, it is

clear that there are very real concerns about drainage from the site and evidence that land drainage currently poses problems. These are matters that any development would need to address, but whilst problematic, I have seen nothing to suggest that these issues are incapable of satisfactory resolution.

4.96 The relationship of development with the adjacent listed property at Whinburn and neighbouring dwellings, trees within the site, wildlife habitats and the presence of a high pressure water main, are all matters that would need to be addressed if or when the site was to be re-appraised in the future. They are not matters that need negate the safeguarding of the land at the present time. I therefore conclude that the safeguarded land designation of the site is appropriate and that no modification is required to the RDDP.

### **Recommendation**

4.97 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/UR5.25: Shann Lane, Black Hill, Keighley (K/H2.22)**

### **Objector**

3839/12112 *Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site as there is a shortage in supply, the land is within the Keighley urban area, there are no constraints to development, and off-site highway improvements would be of wider community benefit. Failing this it should be a phase 2 allocation.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.98 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H2.22 below, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

4.99 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.25 and allocation of the land as a phase 2 housing site.**

**K/UR5.26: North Dean Avenue, Guard House, Keighley (SOM/K/GB1/36, K/H2.23, SOM/K/H1/36)**

### **Objectors**

4225/12645 *Mr & Mrs K Marshall*  
5022/12675 *Goldfinch (Projects) Ltd*



## Summary of Objections

- The land should be re-allocated as a phase 1 housing site in line with its present allocation in the adopted UDP.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.100 I have considered these objections in relation to K/H2.23 and SOM/K/GB1/36 below, to which reference should be made.

## Recommendation

4.101 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **K/UR5.27 & SOM/K/H1/37: Occupation Lane (West), Exley Head, Keighley (K/H2.24)**

### Objectors

2509/12632 & 12633 *Elders and Trustees Trinity URC*  
4214/12590 & 12591 *Mr Charles Laycock*  
4228/12673 & 12674 *Trustees of Frank Sugden Decd.*

## Summary of Objections

- The plan makes inadequate provision for housing. The land should not be safeguarded but should continue to be allocated for housing as a phase 1 site. There is no explanation of the change.
- The nature of the land has not changed since it was first allocated as a housing site, it is suitable for development and should be allowed to proceed.
- There is no recognition of the planning history and long-term commitment to the release of the land.
- There is no explanation as to how the site performs against other sites allocated as phase 1 and 2 sites.
- Though affected by access constraints associated with K/UR5.8 there is no reason why this site should not be developed if a Development Brief addresses the constraints.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.102 This is a greenfield site of enclosed pasture towards the south-western edge of Keighley. It has a frontage to the unadopted and poorly maintained Occupation Lane and lies between sites K/UR5.28 to the east (Occupation Lane (East) site) and K/UR5.8 to the west. Whilst allocated as a housing site within the adopted UDP and shown as a phase 2 site within the FDDP, its allocation was changed in the RDDP to safeguarded land. It is now one of 7 safeguarded sites within this general location. Because of access constraints it is particularly closely tied to the above-mentioned immediately adjacent sites. It was in light of the reduced annual housing requirement figures contained in RPG12, and the Council's sustainability appraisal, that the site was reallocated from housing to safeguarded land.

4.103 In terms of Policy H2 of RPG12, being an extension to Keighley the site falls within the fourth of the categories in the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land. The

site is therefore a relatively lowly one in the sequential approach. It is not particularly well located in relation to shops, services and primary schools, these being some distance away. There is a long, steep gradient back towards Keighley, which I consider would be a further deterrent to walking and cycling. However, a 10-minute frequency bus service passes the site in Oakworth Road. In overall sustainability terms the site is not well placed. Despite the Council's previous commitment to residential development, the site should not be allocated for housing within the life of the plan.

- 4.104 The land never has been designated as Green Belt and is not subject to any intensive use. The present junction arrangement between Occupation Lane and Oakworth Road is substandard. I consider it likely that a realistic means of gaining satisfactory access to the site would be via a new junction with Oakworth Road created in conjunction with the development of the Occupation Lane (East) site. I have no reason to believe that, given this latter site's frontage to Oakworth Road, a satisfactory engineering solution could not be found, such as that suggested in the Council's 1991 Development Brief. This related to both the Occupation Lane East and West sites and the now K/UR5.8 land. I am not aware of any other insuperable infrastructure constraints to future development. It is my view that the land is likely to be capable of future development and, like the Occupation Lane (East) site, is correctly allocated as safeguarded land.

### **Recommendation**

- 4.105 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/UR5.28 & SOM/K/H1/277: Occupation Lane (East), Exley Head, Keighley (K/H2.25)**

#### **Objectors**

4214/12592/93      *Mr Charles Laycock*  
4227/12647/48      *Helez Properties Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The plan makes inadequate provision for housing. The land should not be safeguarded but should continue to be allocated for housing as a phase 1 site. There is no explanation of the change.
- The nature of the land has not changed since it was first allocated as a housing site, it is suitable for development and should be allowed to proceed.
- There is no recognition of the planning history and long-term commitment to the release of the land.
- There is no explanation as to how the site performs against other sites allocated as phase 1 and 2 sites.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.106 This is a greenfield site of enclosed pasture on the south-western fringe of Keighley lying to the immediate east of the Occupation Lane (West) site discussed above. Given the similar characteristics of the sites my views relating to its allocation are the same as those in respect of this other site. Reference should therefore be made to K/UR5.27 for my fuller reasoning and conclusions.

## **Recommendation**

4.107 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/UR5.32: Off Lees Lane (South), Haworth (K/H2.32)**

#### **Objectors**

2457/12085                      *Mrs M H Merrett*  
2458/12086                      *Mr R R P and Mrs A L Ackroyd*  
4146/12581                      *Skipton Properties Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be allocated as village greenspace.
- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.108 I have considered these objections in relation to K/H2.32 below, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

4.109 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the site's designation as safeguarded land K/UR5.32.**

### **SOM/K/UR5/21: Hainsworth Road, Silsden (K/H2.37)**

#### **Objector**

3839/7106                      *Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- This should be allocated as safeguarded land.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.110 I deal with this objection under reference SOM/GB1/21 below, where I conclude that the site should largely be included in the Green Belt.

## **Recommendation**

4.111 **My recommendation is given under reference SOM/GB1/21 below.**

**SOM/K/UR5/24: Woodside Road, Silsden (K/H2.2)**

**Objectors**

4084/5793 *J and S Mitchell*

**Summary of Objection**

- Previously developed land should be allocated first. The sewerage system is poor.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.112 I deal with this objection under reference UR5.14 above, where I conclude that the site should be included within the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

4.113 **My recommendation is given under reference UR5.14 above.**

**SOM/K/UR5/28 & 29: Banklands Avenue (West and East), Silsden (K/H2.7-8)**

**Objector**

3839/7107-8 *Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*

**Summary of Objections**

- These sites should be allocated as safeguarded land.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.114 I deal with these objections under reference SOM/GB1/28&29 below, where I conclude that the sites should be included in the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

4.115 **My recommendation is given under reference SOM/GB1/28&29 below.**

**SOM/K/UR5/32: Hainsworth Wood Road, Woodhouse, Keighley (K/H2.19)**

**Objector**

4993/12609 *West Yorkshire Ecology*

**Summary of Objection**

- The site is of ecological interest and should be protected.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.116 Within the RDDP this site has been split into both safeguarded land and a housing allocation. I have considered this objection in relation to K/UR5.23 and K/H2.19, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

4.117 See the recommendations on K/UR5.23 and K/H2.19.

### **SOM/K/UR5/107, SOM/K/H1/107, SOM/K/H2/107 & SOM/K/GB1/107: Land at Crossfield Road, Oxenhope**

#### **Objector**

1930/5603 - 06      *Mrs Dorothy Lee*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The Green Belt boundary in this part of Oxenhope is artificially and too tightly drawn.
- Oxenhope is a sustainable settlement and the RDDP makes only limited provision for new housing development. Adjustment to the Green Belt boundary should be made to allow for longer-term needs particularly as the RDDP is over optimistic in its assumptions about achievable housing densities.
- Land to the west of development in Crossfield Close should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated as a phase 1 or 2 housing site or as safeguarded land.
- The revised Green Belt boundary would be defensible and robust.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.118 The land the objector wishes to see excluded from the Green Belt comprises a gently sloping area of enclosed grassland on the north-western edge of Oxenhope. My comments and conclusions on the general housing strategy of the RDDP have been set out in the Policy Framework volume of this report. In terms of Policy H2 of RPG12 the objection land is a greenfield site lying on the edge of a village that comes towards the bottom of the sequential hierarchy; it is a relatively remote settlement from the main urban areas with very limited local facilities and public transport provision. I consider that the Green Belt boundary has not been drawn so tightly around the village that further limited residential development would be precluded.

4.119 The suggested western boundary of the site, following a dry-stone wall and stream with intermittent trees, would in itself represent a long-term defensible Green Belt boundary. Nevertheless, the existing boundary that defines the western curtilage of Moor House and dwellings to the western side of Crossfield Close is in my view clear and robust, even though there may always have been an intention on the part of the landowner/developer that there would be further development to the west.

4.120 The field lying between these dwellings and the suggested boundary provides part of the attractive landscape setting for this part of Oxenhope, and the current boundary would prevent further encroachment of development into the open countryside. As PPG2 indicates, this is one of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. This applies

equally to the possible alteration of the boundary to the rear of No. 1 Crossfield Close that might permit the construction of a single dwelling. I do not consider that there are any exceptional circumstances, including the personal circumstances of the objector, that are sufficient to justify modifying the Green Belt boundary insofar as this grassland is concerned.

- 4.121 I do, however, agree with the objector that there appears little logic in the Green Belt boundary being drawn between Nos. 21A and 23 Crossfield Road such that the latter and its lengthy rear garden fall within the Green Belt. In my view this property is clearly part of this small residential development. I consider its inclusion in the Green Belt serves no Green Belt function or purpose. Its western boundary would make a more sensible long-term Green Belt boundary. The Council's review of the Green Belt, the relationship of this land to the built form of the village, and the need for an enduring and robust Green Belt boundary, are exceptional circumstances justifying a modification of the boundary. Accordingly, I recommend a change in the Green Belt boundary to exclude No. 23 Crossfield Road.

### **Recommendation**

- 4.122 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the curtilage of No. 23 Crossfield Road from the Green Belt on the Proposals Map.**

### **SOM/K/UR5/231 & SOM/K/H1/231: Land at Turner Lane, Addingham (Part of K/GB1.4)**

#### **Objector**

3831/7509 & 7520 *Cala Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be allocated for housing or, failing this, safeguarded land, rather than Green Belt in light of the probable shortfall in housing land provision.
- The presence of the Green Belt to the south-eastern and north-eastern sides of Addingham present significant constraints to future development.
- The site is a logical consolidation of Addingham and has good defensible Green Belt boundaries.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.123 I have considered the major extension to the Green Belt around the north of Addingham in relation to K/GB1.4 where I have accepted the Council's argument that there are exceptional circumstances why this should take place.
- 4.124 The objection land is a triangular grassed field, with a track to its northern end and a single dwelling to one corner, and lies within this wider tranche of Green Belt. The land forms part of a series of more open areas of land between the western edge of Addingham and the A65 as it bypasses the village. I have concluded above that the adjoining land to the north (K/UR5.1), which the Council wishes to see allocated as safeguarded land, should be designated as Green Belt. In my view, the present objection site fulfils the Green Belt purposes of preventing the outward spread of Addingham and protecting the countryside setting of this part of the village. By restricting development it

also helps to focus this within the urban areas where it can assist in regeneration. I accept that the bypass would itself act as a logical Green Belt boundary. Nevertheless, I consider that, assuming the inclusion of K/UR5.1 within the Green Belt also, the boundaries as shown within the RDDP are no less robust and defensible. Therefore, I consider the objection land is correctly designated as Green Belt.

4.125 My conclusions and recommendations regarding the RDDP's overall amounts and location of housing provision are contained in the Policy Framework volume of this report. Whilst I have identified a sufficiency in provision within phase 1 there is a shortfall within phase 2 and in the amount of safeguarded land needed to ensure that the Green Belt boundary endures well beyond the plan period. However, in terms of Policy H2 of RPG12 Addingham comes at the bottom of the hierarchy in the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land. It is a rural settlement where the provision of housing should be to meet local needs and/or support local services. I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that the allocation of the land for housing is required to meet local housing needs. There is nothing therefore to elevate the site above those which, in locational and sustainability terms, are better placed.

4.126 I have recommended that the Council carries out a full-scale Green Belt review to encompass sufficient safeguarded land to provide for development needs up to 2026. I do not consider it would be appropriate to consider the site's allocation as safeguarded land in advance of such a review. It is therefore my overall conclusion that no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

### **Recommendation**

4.127 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/UR5/233, SOM/K/H1/233, SOM/K/H2/233 & SOM/K/GB1/233: Land to west of Carr Bank, Riddlesden**

#### **Objector**

3842/10106-10109 *Taywood Homes Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing or as safeguarded land.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.128 The roughly rectangular site comprises a series of fields, some with mature trees, on the northern slopes of the Aire valley. It is bordered to the south and west by the extensive housing site, K/H1.16, where development is well advanced, and to the east by what was a formerly outlying, small, local authority housing development, some houses of which have now been demolished. The site boundaries are clearly defined to the east, south and west where they follow the lines of existing and proposed development. The remaining site boundary does not follow any features on the ground and has been chosen to line through from the northern extent of the K/H1.16 housing site to the northern limit of the local authority housing. The land is designated Green Belt within the adopted UDP and

this is carried through to the RDDP. I agree with the Council that the Green Belt boundaries that have been chosen are robust.

- 4.129 I agree with the Council that this site serves Green Belt purposes. It contributes to the extensive tract of Green Belt separating Keighley from Ilkley. Besides assisting this separating function it also has the roles of preventing the further sprawl of residential development that has occurred along the lower valley slopes at Riddlesden, and safeguarding the attractive and open countryside on the higher slopes that serves to frame and contain existing development. The site is clearly visible and prominent from viewpoints across the valley and from the Aire Valley Road.
- 4.130 The Inspector reporting on objections to the now adopted UDP was of the view that it was important that there should not be a relentless sprawl northwards of development, a view with which I concur. In my view, no matter what form of layout and design of residential development might be undertaken on the site this would not overcome the fundamental harm to the purposes of the Green Belt fulfilled by the objection land in its present form.
- 4.131 I disagree with the claim that the site lies within the Council's 400-metre walking threshold from bus stops. In my view all the site lies beyond this range and because of its extent most of it would be considerably more distant. I consider that this, coupled with the site's elevated position up the sloping valley side, would dissuade occupiers from switching from car to bus as a favoured means of transport. Distance from a meaningful selection of shops and community facilities, and from the nearest primary school, also persuade me that development on the site would not have a level of sustainability to suggest that, exceptionally, the site should be released from the Green Belt for housing purposes.
- 4.132 I attach a great deal of importance to the function of the Green Belt within this area. This, together with the relatively poor sustainability characteristics of the objection land, leads me to conclude that it would not be appropriate as a housing allocation. Nor do I consider it appropriate to consider the site's allocation as safeguarded land in advance of further review of the Green Belt by the Council. Accordingly, it is my view that no modification of the RDDP is necessary.

## **Recommendation**

- 4.133 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/UR5/382 and SOM/K/GB1/382: Field No. 411, Wheathead Lane, Keighley**

## **Objector**

3920/10931

*Mr David Wood*

## **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated either as a phase 2 housing site or as safeguarded land.
- Development would be an extension of the urban form, would relate well to adjoining housing and would not affect the character of the area.



## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.134 The objection land comprises a prominent sloping pasture field of almost 2.4 hectares and forms part of the open expanse of countryside to the west of Keighley designated as Green Belt. Whilst the site has clearly defined boundaries to the west and north of stone walls and a substantial immature tree belt, I consider the presently defined Green Belt boundaries are equally clear and robust and the land fulfils Green Belt purposes. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is a sufficiency in the supply of phase 1 housing sites made up from sites with planning permissions and those within the urban areas.
- 4.135 I have identified a shortfall in the phase 2 supply I do not consider that the site performs particularly well in sustainability terms. It is remote from shops, services and most facilities, although it is within walking distance of a 20-minute frequency bus service. The site comes well down the hierarchy in the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land of RPG Policy H2 and does not accord well with advice in PPG3 regarding the allocation of housing land. In my view the site is not a strong contender to help make up the shortfall in phase 2 provision.
- 4.136 I have also identified a considerable shortfall in safeguarded land provision. I have recommended that a full-scale review of the Green Belt take place to ensure that sufficient safeguarded land is encompassed to provide for housing needs well beyond the plan period. Nevertheless, at this stage I do not consider that this, in itself, amounts to an exceptional circumstance why this site should be currently released from the Green Belt.

## Recommendation

- 4.137 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/UR7/18: Sykes Lane, Silsden (K/E1.9)**

## Objectors

3839/7103                      *Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*  
4222/8002                      *Mr Albert Muff*

## Summary of Objections

- This land should constitute, or form part of, a mixed use area.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.138 I deal with this objection under reference E1.9 below, where I conclude that the land should not be designated as a mixed use area.

## Recommendation

- 4.139 **My recommendation is given under reference E1.9 below.**

**SOM/K/UR7/20: Station Road, Oxenhope (K/E1.22)**

**Objector**

4288/5796 *Mr Peter Hudman*

**Summary of Objection**

- The site should be allocated for mixed use or housing instead of employment.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.140 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.22 below. I conclude that allocation for employment use is inappropriate.

**Recommendation**

4.141 **My recommendation is given under reference E1.22 below.**

**SOM/K/UR7/91: Silsden Local Centre (Sykes Lane)**

**Objector**

4222/10992 *Mr Albert Muff*

**Summary of Objection**

- This land should form part of a mixed use area.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.142 I have considered this objection together with SOM/K/CR7/91 below to which reference should be made.

**Recommendation**

4.143 **See my recommendation in relation to SOM/K/CR7/91.**

**SOM/K/UR7/105.01, SOM/K/E6/105.01 & SOM/K/CF6/105.01: Premises at Bradford Street, Keighley**

**Objector**

4184/10138-40 *George Farrar (Quarries) Ltd*

**Summary of Objections**

- The E6 and CF6 designations should be replaced by a mixed use designation.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.144 The objection site is in employment use, and is within an Employment Zone where Policy E6 would apply. There are residential and community uses on the opposite side of Bradford Street, but this side of the road is entirely in employment use and, in response to an objection by Asda Stores Limited, I have recommended that the E6 designation be retained on the adjoining Peter Black site. Although land to the other side of Lawkholme Lane has been removed from the Employment Zone, this site relates more closely to the area to the east, and I consider that the Employment Zone boundary has been appropriately drawn.
- 4.145 In addition, the mixed use areas identified in the RDDP are generally extensive areas of unused or underused land and buildings, where a more intensive and varied use of land and buildings is needed. The focus is on areas where there is potential to improve the economic and social vitality and viability of these urban areas, to contribute to area-based regeneration and to manage change. This is a single employment site, which appears to be fully used at present, and the current occupiers have indicated that they have no plans to vacate the site. I do not therefore consider that it is suitable for allocation as a mixed use area under the terms of Policy UR7.
- 4.146 In relation to Policy CF6, the Council has not commented on this objection. However, I consider a similar objection in another part of the district, and note that the Community Priority Areas have been widely drawn, and there are sites within them that are unsuitable for community use. In addition, I have recommended that Policy CF6 be modified to relate only to open space or other land in community use, and hence it would not apply to the objection site, but I do not consider that the boundaries of the Community Priority Area should be changed.

### **Recommendation**

- 4.147 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/UR7/380: Land south of the canal, Silsden**

#### **Objector**

4222/11290                      *Mr Albert Muff*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The whole of the area south of the Leeds-Liverpool canal should be a mixed use area.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.148 This is an extensive area of land to the south of Silsden, which is currently allocated primarily for employment but with one area allocated for housing, and another as an Expansion Area for convenience shopping. I deal with most parts of the area individually elsewhere in this volume of my report.
- 4.149 In fact the objector appears primarily to be seeking a residential allocation for his land, and this is what I recommend below (K/E1.9). In my opinion this effectively meets the

objection, but I deal below with the other implications of the objection as it is put in the objection form.

- 4.150 The mixed use areas identified in the RDDP are generally areas of unused or underused land and buildings, where a more intensive and varied use of land and buildings is needed. The focus is on areas where there is potential to improve the economic and social vitality and viability of these urban areas, to contribute to area-based regeneration and to manage change. This is not an area where, in general, there is a need for regeneration, which could be helped by the flexibility afforded by a mixed use allocation. Parts of the suggested mixed use area are being developed for employment uses, and part of the site meets the purposes of including land in Green Belts. I do not therefore consider that the land is suitable for allocation as a mixed use area under the terms of Policy UR7.

### **Recommendation**

- 4.151 **My recommendations are given in the various sections of my report dealing with the objections to specific parts of this area. Otherwise I recommend no further modification in response to this objection.**

## Chapter 5 Economy and Employment

### K/E1.1: Lyon Road, Steeton with Eastburn

#### Objector

3842/6862                      *Taywood Homes Ltd*

#### Summary of Objection

- The site is unlikely to be developed for employment and should be allocated for housing under Policy H2.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.1 I note that almost all the site is shown on the Interim Floodplain Map 2002, published by the Environment Agency. Whilst the precise boundaries are subject to further study, the Council has accepted that the land is within high-risk zone 3 of PPG25. Indeed in November 2002 planning permission was refused for the construction of a general purpose agricultural building on part of the site. The reason for refusal was that the site was within the functional floodplain where new buildings are permitted only in exceptional circumstances for the purposes of transport and utilities infrastructure. The Council has also proposed an amendment to the text accompanying site K/E1.1, stating that the land is within high-risk zone 3b). Table 1 of PPG25 makes it clear that residential development in such a location is unacceptable, unless limited to job-related accommodation.
- 5.2 However, the Council appears to be somewhat inconsistent in arguing that the site is, nevertheless, acceptable for employment development. The advice in PPG25 is that such an area is generally not suitable for commercial and industrial development unless a particular location is essential, e.g. for navigation and water-based recreation uses, agriculture and essential transport and utilities infrastructure, and an alternative lower-risk location is not available. In the absence of evidence of the needs of the adjoining employment use it is not possible to state that the location is essential for its expansion and that an alternative lower-risk location is not available. If such expansion need is forthcoming, utilising site K/UR5.2 may prove to be a more appropriate alternative lower-risk location.
- 5.3 In these circumstances I conclude that a residential allocation for the site is unacceptable. Employment use, even for expansion of the adjoining employment activity, is inappropriate, unless it can be shown that such use is essential and no lower-risk alternative location is available, or that acceptable flood mitigation measures would be implemented. I consider that, in the light of the evidence available to me, the employment allocation on the site should be deleted and a safeguarded land designation substituted. This would allow for the possibility of future expansion of the adjoining employment use, taking account of increased precision in the determination of the boundaries of the floodplain, the availability of alternative locations and the implementation of appropriate flood mitigation measures.

## **Recommendation**

- 5.4 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the employment allocation and its substitution by a designation as safeguarded land.**

### **K/E1.3: Station Road, Steeton with Eastburn**

#### **Objectors**

2031/3444                      *Mrs Dorothy Buffey*  
4075/11256                    *Mr M T Greaves*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted in view of problems relating to traffic, loss of wildlife habitat and effect on drainage and sewerage.
- Any development should provide and maintain a tree screen along the southern boundary of the site.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 5.5 The site is small and the scale of possible development is unlikely to result in excessive vehicular traffic. I have no evidence that the land has any recognised wildlife importance, it does not lie within the washlands of the River Aire, and I understand that there is adequate sewerage capacity to cope with future development.
- 5.6 The question of a tree screen is more appropriately considered at the stage when planning applications have been submitted. I have no reason to believe that the Council would not give proper consideration to the need for landscaping of the site should development proposals be forthcoming.
- 5.7 I consider that the site makes little contribution to the employment land needs of the district as access is possible only through the adjoining existing employment use. Nevertheless, it is an appropriate location and could provide a site for expansion of the adjoining user, or some future redevelopment.

## **Recommendation**

- 5.8 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/E1.4: Keighley Road/Belton Road, Silsden (SOM/K/GB1/17)**

#### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt and used for agriculture or open space.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 5.9 I have already indicated that I do not consider Silsden to be part of the urban area and that the scale of proposed allocations for employment and housing are not appropriate in this location.
- 5.10 In terms of this specific site, I do not consider that employment development here is necessary or appropriate to cater for local needs. The site is too distant from the main urban areas to provide for the needs of those areas. The location is unsustainable and would lead to additional journeys, many of them by private motor vehicles. Therefore, the employment allocation should be deleted.
- 5.11 In terms of future use, the land provides good open views along the Aire valley and forms an important part of the setting of Silsden. I have no compelling evidence of the need for open space provision on the scale of this site, and in any event the land is some distance from most of the residential areas. I consider that continued use for agriculture would be appropriate.
- 5.12 In terms of Green Belt designation, the land forms an important part of the separation of Silsden and Steeton, development would very significantly encroach into the open countryside, and use of this land would detract from efforts to regenerate the urban areas. Therefore, it performs important functions of the Green Belt and purposes of including land within it.
- 5.13 The overall factors of the preparation of the replacement UDP, including a review of the Green Belt, together with the increased emphasis on sustainable development and the re-use of previously-developed land in the urban areas, constitute exceptional circumstances for the alteration of the extent of the Green Belt. The locational, physical and visual characteristics of the site itself add to these special circumstances to warrant the designation of the land as Green Belt. I recommend accordingly.
- 5.14 Specific concerns were raised by objectors in relation to flooding, the capacity of the drainage system, the loss of wildlife habitats and the nature of the possible employment activities.
- 5.15 I note that the Council has suggested reducing the allocated area in order to exclude land shown to be within the washlands area of the River Aire (generally equating to the functional floodplain). This would accord with the advice in PPG25, especially where there is no local need for the employment allocation or evidence of social or economic stagnation.
- 5.16 I have no evidence that sewerage and surface water drainage systems could not be designed to accommodate the flows that would be generated by employment development. There are no objections from the responsible bodies on these matters. Similarly, the site does not have any officially recognised nature conservation or wildlife status even at local level. Whilst concern was expressed at the possibility of B2 and B8 uses on the site, I consider that such development would be far enough away from residential areas not to result in significant harm. Nevertheless, my overall conclusion is that the allocation of the site for employment use is inappropriate and unacceptable in terms of national, regional and local policy advice on sustainable development.

## **Recommendation**

**5.17 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the employment allocation and designation of the site as Green Belt.**

**K/E1.5: Belton Road, Silsden (SOM/K/GB1/70)**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The employment use allocation should be deleted and the land returned to the Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.18 Various planning permissions for employment developments have been granted for parts of the site, and at the time of my site visit some development had been completed and more was under construction. Thus the site is committed to employment use and work has commenced on most of it.

5.19 In these circumstances it is not appropriate to alter the allocation in the RDDP, and the site no longer satisfies any of the purposes or functions of the Green Belt.

## **Recommendation**

**5.20 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/E1.6: Keighley Road (North), Silsden (SOM/K/CR7/71 & SOM/K/GB1/71)**

### **Objectors**

954/3901	<i>Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber</i>
1757/7297	<i>Mr Eric Bottomley</i>
1764/7290	<i>Mrs Patricia Bottomley</i>
1767/7545	<i>Mr Andrew Craig Bottomley</i>
2031/3434	<i>Mrs Dorothy Buffey</i>
2487/5302	<i>Mrs D'Arcy</i>
2614/4884	<i>Silsden Town Council</i>
2696/3267	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
3869/9888	<i>Miss Vera M Waugh</i>
3946/4779	<i>Mrs Patricia Norris</i>
4032/4701	<i>Mr Keith Norris</i>
4066/4572	<i>Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)</i>
4151/2961	<i>Laxton Crawford Limited</i>
4222/10987	<i>Mr Albert Muff</i>
4280/4933	<i>Ann Cryer MP</i>
4318/5299	<i>Mr D'Arcy</i>
4585/10165	<i>Mr Richard Chatburn</i>



## Summary of Objections

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt.
- A wider variety of uses should be permitted on the site, including leisure, non-food retail or showrooms.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.21 The site is surrounded on three sides by employment uses and the land to the south is allocated for employment (K/E1.7). It is a flat, unused site with access from the service road to the Cobbydale Mills building to the north. Silsden Beck runs along the frontage to Keighley Road and is lined with mature trees that provide an effective screen to the site.
- 5.22 The land does not serve any of the functions of the Green Belt or the purposes for including land within it. Conversely, it forms a good quality employment location adjoining other employment uses easily accessible to the local population, services and facilities. It could provide employment opportunities in keeping with the scale of Silsden that could reduce the degree of out-commuting. Accordingly, its allocation for employment use is appropriate.
- 5.23 The site is not restricted to core employment uses and, therefore, a fairly wide range of activities would be acceptable, including showrooms such as for car sales. At the Employment Land Round Table Session it was clarified that some leisure and tourism uses are also acceptable on land allocated for employment. However, non-food and other retailing activities are subject to other policies in the RDDP and the objection site does not comply with the criteria indicated in them. It is too remote from the main retail centre of Silsden to be regarded as complementary to and supportive of that centre. Therefore, I consider that the allocation of the land for employment is appropriate and provides sufficient flexibility of use.

## Recommendation

- 5.24 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/E1.7: Keighley Road (Centre), Silsden (SOM/K/GB1/72)**

## Objectors

954/3904	<i>Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber</i>
1757/7298	<i>Mr Eric Bottomley</i>
1764/7534	<i>Mrs Patricia Bottomley</i>
1767/7546	<i>Mr Andrew Craig Bottomley</i>
2031/3435	<i>Mrs Dorothy Buffey</i>
2487/5306	<i>Mrs D'Arcy</i>
2614/4885	<i>Silsden Town Council</i>
2696/3266	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
3869/9890	<i>Miss Vera M Waugh</i>
3946/4756	<i>Mrs Patricia Norris</i>
4032/4702	<i>Mr Keith Norris</i>
4066/4570	<i>Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)</i>
4151/2961	<i>Laxton Crawford Ltd.</i>

4222/10988	<i>Mr Albert Muff</i>
4280/4934	<i>Ann Cryer MP</i>
4318/5298	<i>Mr D'Arcy</i>
4585/10166	<i>Mr Richard Chatburn</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted, and the land designated as Green Belt.
- A greater variety of uses should be accepted for the site, including non-food retail, leisure and showrooms.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.25 This site adjoins and is a continuation of K/E1.6 and the cases for and against the employment allocation are similar. I have considered these above in relation to K/E1.6 and there is no need to repeat them here. The site does not fulfil the functions or purposes of the Green Belt and it relates poorly to the main shopping area of Silsden. The RDDP does not restrict development to core employment uses and so there is a degree of flexibility in the types of activities that would be acceptable, subject to other policies in the RDDP, particularly in relation to retailing.

### **Recommendation**

5.26 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/E1.8: Keighley Road (South), Silsden (SOM/K/GB1/73)**

#### **Objectors**

1764/7535	<i>Mrs Patricia Bottomley</i>
2614/4886	<i>Silsden Town Council</i>
2696/3276	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
3869/9891	<i>Miss Vera M Waugh</i>
3946/4755	<i>Mrs Patricia Norris</i>
4032/4703	<i>Mr Keith Norris</i>
4066/4569	<i>Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)</i>
4222/10989	<i>Mr Albert Muff</i>
4280/11044	<i>Ann Cryer MP</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.27 This site has now been fully developed for employment use and does not fulfil any of the functions or purposes of the Green Belt. Accordingly, the land is appropriately allocated for employment use and designation as Green Belt is unacceptable.

### **Recommendation**

5.28 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **K/E1.9, SOM/K/UR7/18, SOM/K/OS1/18, SOM/K/GB1/18: Sykes Lane, Silsden**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be designated as a mixed use area. Without a large element of housing development no employment use would be forthcoming, bearing in mind the difficulties of developing the land.
- The scale of greenfield employment allocations in Silsden seems excessive for such a remote location.
- Development would harm conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeology, drainage, residential amenities, trees and hedgerows, agriculture, and both traffic flow and safety.
- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt or open space.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

#### *Allocation for Employment or Mixed Use Purposes*

- 5.29 The Council and Bryant Homes both consider that there is a need for employment uses here, and that the location would be attractive to such uses. I deal with these arguments above (paragraphs 3.30 et seq) where I conclude that Silsden is not a suitable location for large scale employment allocations. To meet local needs, there is undeveloped land remaining at Keighley Road/Belton Road.
- 5.30 In order to develop some of the Sykes Lane area for employment purposes, Bryant Homes argues that it would be necessary first to secure housing development on the eastern part of the land. In fact this objector's proposal is that more than half of the site (perhaps 4.5-5has) would be used for housing, and only up to 3 has would be employment land.
- 5.31 Both proposals, for employment and for mixed uses, face the objection which faces the Silsden development allocations generally, namely that they would use a large area of greenfield land in a settlement which is some distance from the main urban area, and which does not have good direct public transport links.
- 5.32 Bryant Homes argues that the development of the whole of the objection site for employment uses is not viable. The employment proposal is of longstanding but only part of the original allocation, land close to Keighley Road, has been taken up. The remaining land mostly has a backland relationship with Keighley Road, and is in many ownerships. The Council says that funding will be available through the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) to secure development, funding which was not previously available. The identification of the site within the IDP indicates it has development problems. No match funding has yet been earmarked, and one aim of the IDP is to achieve economic activity with minimal or no public support. Within the IDP the site does not have high priority; sites lower down the Aire Valley and in Bradford are preferred. The objection land is a possible Stage 2 project but may be pushed outside the time boundaries of the IDP by sites from the preferred locations.

- 5.33 There is sufficient evidence of difficulties with the development of the site to cast doubt on its viability, particularly given its location distant from major communication nodes. The objector's scheme would overcome development problems. Furthermore the majority of the land lies within the built form of the settlement, having housing, playing fields and allotments to the north, mixed urban uses to the east, and the Weavestyle factory to the south. However, as I have said, housing on the scale proposed by the objector gives rise to the serious objection that it would mostly use greenfield land in the relatively unsustainable Silsden location. The objector's proposal also has the disadvantage of a separate industrial access through the playing fields south of the Weavestyle factory. In my view this would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.
- 5.34 The Bryant Homes scheme would increase recreational provision in the Green Belt to the south, but this does not outweigh the objections to the mixed use proposal.
- 5.35 Many of the detailed objections put forward by those opposed to development on the land do not stand up to analysis. Parts of the site fall within or adjacent to the Silsden Conservation Area and the Leeds-Liverpool Canal Conservation Area, but conservation area policies do not prevent development altogether. In principle it is possible to develop conservation areas in ways which preserve or enhance their character or appearance. Nor does proximity to listed buildings rule out development. Archaeological interests could be safeguarded by way of conditions on a planning permission. Existing housing could be protected from harmful effects by careful attention to the layout and design of new development. The objection land is not subject to flooding and is not of great value as agricultural land. Most of it is used for activities like allotments and horse grazing. Access problems could be overcome now that the Council has bought the necessary land for sightlines. Most traffic to and from the site would travel out of Silsden to the south and would not add to congestion in the centre of Silsden.
- 5.36 Nevertheless there remains the major objection I outline above to the employment allocation and to the rival mixed use scheme.

#### *Local Needs Housing: Phase 1*

- 5.37 In my opinion sustainability considerations suggest that most of the objection site remain undeveloped. RPG Policy H2 does allow for local needs housing to be provided in rural areas, however (see above – paragraph 0). Parts of the objection site are previously-developed land and I consider that local needs housing could be provided, centred on the previously-developed land element of the site. The land is within easy reach of local shops and services, and the Council does not resist arguments that housing would meet policy requirements.
- 5.38 I cannot recommend a precise site for local needs housing, for a variety of reasons. Firstly, the size of the housing development which would be needed must be assessed. Secondly, the previously-developed land is divided into 2 parts. One part is the north-western corner of the site, and the previously-developed land extends beyond the site boundary towards the canal bridge. The southern area of previously-developed land is adjacent to the Weavestyle factory and I have noticed on site visits that the industry causes a certain amount of noise. A housing scheme based on the previously-developed land at and near the objection site might need to utilise some greenfield land to make the best use of the previously-developed land, perhaps with some compensating return of previously-developed land near the factory to greenfield status. The Council, aided by

other parties as necessary, is best placed to decide on the scale and arrangement of a housing allocation to meet local needs.

- 5.39 As the local need already exists, and previously-developed land is available to meet it, I consider that the housing allocation on the objection site should be a phase 1 allocation. Purely for the sake of estimating global housing figures, I assume that one hectare of land would be allocated. As the site is near services, and a local need is to be met, a higher density development would be likely, giving about 50 dwellings.

### *Green Belt*

- 5.40 There remains the question of how to designate the remainder of the land, i.e. the majority of the objection site. The western part of the site is a continuation of the open countryside which sweeps up from the floodplain of the River Aire to the existing edge of the settlement, which immediately north of the site can be taken to be the allotments between the canal and Woodside Road. This western section of the site consists largely of pasture land with the Green Belt to the west and south. The open western end of the Weavestyle site juts out between the fields and paddocks of the objection land to the north and the recreational land to the south. In my view this narrow salient of Weavestyle land should not dictate the boundary of the Green Belt to the north or west. The Green Belt boundary should be brought in closer to the settlement, to include in the Green Belt the fields on the western part of the objection site.
- 5.41 There is a series of north-south field boundaries suitable for use as Green Belt boundaries. That which incorporates a wall in its southern section and a hedge in its northern section would constitute a satisfactory Green Belt boundary, which would not include too much open land within the settlement limits. This boundary would roughly continue northwards the line of the end of the Weavestyle building, which is sufficiently prominent to give the appearance of being the edge of development south of Sykes Lane. Inclusion in the Green Belt of the western part of the objection land would help to check the growth of Silsden in this direction and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. It would also have the subsidiary effect of protecting hedgerows and trees from loss through development.
- 5.42 In my opinion there are exceptional circumstances for adding this part of the site to the Green Belt. My conclusions regarding the sustainability of development in Silsden, in the light of regional policy in particular, falsify the assumptions which led to the Green Belt boundary being drawn along the western edge of the objection site.

### *Local Needs Housing: Phase 2*

- 5.43 The central and eastern parts of the site which are not previously-developed land present a problem. The centre of the objection site is unsightly backland which does not function as urban greenspace. There is a variety of sheds, shelters, animals and piles of material on the land, and no party has suggested designation as allotments. I have no evidence of any particular need to protect the existing uses on the site. However, it seems to me that in a settlement the size of Silsden a local need for the provision of housing is likely to arise in the later part of the plan period. The objection land is greenfield land but so is the other potential housing land in Silsden to which my attention has been drawn. Not only is the centre of the objection site within the settlement limits, it is unsightly compared with, say, the Daisy Hill sites. I conclude that the centre of the objection land should be

allocated for phase 2 housing, to meet local needs. For the purposes of calculating housing totals I assume a 3 hectare site and 100 dwellings.

## **Recommendation**

5.44 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:**

- [a] delete allocation K/E1.9**
- [b] locate a phase 1 housing allocation on the eastern part of the site, utilising the previously-developed land in that area, the precise boundaries of the allocation to be decided by the Council**
- [c] locate a phase 2 housing allocation on the central part of the site**
- [d] designate the western part of the site as Green Belt, with the Green Belt boundary running along the eastern hedge of the south-western field of the site, thence eastwards along Sykes Lane for a short distance to the next field boundary on the north side of the lane, and thence northwards along the wall and then the hedge constituting that field boundary.**

**K/E1.11: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (SOM/K/TM20/22, SOM/K/BH7/22, SOM/K/OS1/22, SOM/K/OS2/22, SOM/K/OS3/22 & SOM/K/GB1/22)**

## **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

## **Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land reserved for recreational open space, affordable housing, included within a conservation area or the Green Belt or, at most, that the Leeds Road frontage should be used for office development with the remainder allocated as recreational open space.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 5.45 Various other objections were made in respect of the FDDP. The RDDP included changes including the restriction of development to B1 or B8 uses to prevent harm to nearby housing. In addition, the supporting text indicated the incorporation into the development of a cycleway and recreational open space, and the deletion of references to the siting of a household waste centre and nuisance from the nearby sewage treatment works.
- 5.46 In relation to the remaining objections, the designation of conservation areas is not a matter for the UDP. In addition, being within the built-up area the site does not serve any of the functions or purposes of the Green Belt and it is not appropriate to confer such designation.
- 5.47 It is argued that there is no need for additional employment land in Ilkley, and that this is supported by the fact that permission has been granted in recent years for the use of

- employment land and buildings for other uses. One of the key aspects of national, regional and local policy is the achievement of sustainable development. Amongst other things this requires the provision of new employment opportunities close to where people live, in order to reduce commuting and the use of private motor vehicles.
- 5.48 Ilkley has a shortage of good quality employment land and buildings, with the result that many people commute daily from the town. Whilst some former employment sites and buildings have been lost to other uses in recent years at least some of these may not have been particularly suitable for modern employment activities. I do not consider that this negates the allocation of conveniently located, attractive and topographically suitable sites for employment use.
- 5.49 The objection site has a frontage to Leeds Road, from which a suitable access should be possible and along which regular bus services operate. It is close to housing areas, local services and facilities, and adjoins modern employment premises at the Riverside Business Park.
- 5.50 I accept that the land forms an open break in the urban area, with a number of mature trees, especially around the periphery and the frontage to Leeds Road. I understand that the land is used on occasions as recreational open space by local youth organisations that have premises in the immediate vicinity, and by local residents. The Council would require recreation open space as part of the use of the land for employment. The new provision could be designed for specific recreational uses, in consultation with users of the open space. Bearing this in mind, any loss of visual and recreational amenity there might be as a result of development would in my opinion be outweighed by the need for employment land in Ilkley.
- 5.51 I consider that development of the site as proposed, including access from Leeds Road, could retain the great majority of the mature trees on the site, and this should be included in the supporting text. I note the actions of local residents in seeking to increase the wildlife significance of the site, but it has no official standing even as a site of local wildlife importance.
- 5.52 In terms of concerns about traffic and road safety, Leeds Road is busy at most times of the day, but the frontage of the site would allow for the provision of an adequate access. This should reduce any need for vehicular access from Ashlands Road and the use of its junction with Leeds Road. With regard to additional car parking, the location of the site should encourage the use of public transport, and other procedures already exist to deal with obstruction caused by parking on Leeds Road and Ashlands Road. Whilst there might be some conflict with traffic to and from the school on the south side of Leeds Road, the peak traffic times of the uses would generally not coincide. Again, the encouragement of modes of transport other than the private car, for both work and school journeys, should reduce any potential conflict.
- 5.53 The flooding problems that have been mentioned appear essentially to relate to surface water drainage. Existing procedures require that any development of the site would need to include an appropriate drainage system. Whilst some concern has been expressed in relation to the impact on property values, this is not a matter that is usually relevant to planning. The proposed restriction to B1 and B8 employment uses should reduce any impact on residential amenity and property values.
- 5.54 I conclude, therefore, that the site is appropriately allocated for employment use and is important to the achievement of the objectives of sustainable development. The RDDP

stipulation that development would be restricted to B1 and B8 uses, and would require the provision of publicly accessible recreational open space and a cycleway, seeks to meet the views of objectors on these points whilst ensuring that important local employment opportunities are not lost. In addition, I consider that the text should refer to the desirability of retaining mature trees on the site.

## **Recommendation**

**5.55 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the addition of the following to the site description:**

**Development of the land should make provision for the retention of mature trees on the site.**

## **K/E1.18 - K/E1.21: Beechcliffe, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

2609/7556 - 8

*RSPB*

3549/4903 - 6

*The Environment Agency - Development Planning*

### **Summary of Objections**

- Development of the land should not affect the Beech Cliff Ings Site of Ecological Importance (shown on the Proposals Map as a SEGI) and the biodiversity and hydrology of the area.
- The SEGI should be more clearly defined on the Proposals Map.
- Land within the washlands should be excluded from the development sites.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.56 In view particularly of the objections from the Environment Agency and the publication of PPG25, the Council has suggested to the Inquiry that these 4 sites be combined into one composite site and that the washlands area be excluded from the employment land allocation. Accordingly, revised wording for the RDDP has been suggested together with amendments to the Proposals Map.

5.57 PPG25 makes it clear that built development within functional floodplains should be wholly exceptional and limited to essential transport and utilities infrastructure that has to be there. Whilst the washlands areas shown on the Proposals Map may not be totally congruent with the functional floodplain in all locations, it has been accepted that they are accurate in relation to these sites.

5.58 However, PPG25 also makes reference to situations where development may be needed in order to avoid social and economic stagnation and blight in locations where extensive areas of land fall within high-risk zones. In the evidence presented to the Inquiry relating to SOM/K/E1/352 it was argued that appropriate flood mitigation measures could be implemented that would result in no demonstrable harm, and that such measures were also feasible in relation to sites K/E1.18 - K/E1.21. I have no evidence to indicate that such measures could not be implemented to the satisfaction of the Council in consultation with the Environment Agency. Accordingly, I consider that it would be premature to



discount the potential employment development on those parts of these sites that are shown as being within the washlands.

- 5.59 In relation to the SEGI, the Beech Cliff Ings is shown on the Proposals Map in the same way as other SEGIs are depicted. I consider that the scale of the Proposals Map prevents any greater detail being shown and that the consequent area depicted is acceptable. I note that the Council's proposed amendments exclude the SEGI from the employment land allocation and state that a buffer zone will be required to provide further protection. I consider that the requirement for a buffer zone is necessary and reasonable whilst allowing development of this employment site, which is important strategically and locally in view of the shortage of well-located employment sites in the area.
- 5.60 The exclusion of the washlands area would reduce any impact on the hydrology of the area, but may sterilise the necessary employment development of the site. Proposals for any future development would need to ensure the implementation of adequate and appropriate flood mitigation measures and surface drainage systems. This could be stated in the supporting text. Thus I consider that these aspects would be adequately covered.
- 5.61 Protection of the biodiversity of the land is more difficult to resolve. I noted on my site inspection the range of fauna and flora present on the site, derived from its previous diverse uses and a fairly long period when there has been little physical disturbance of the land. The exclusion of the SEGI and the requirement for a buffer zone will provide some protection, but any development will inevitably reduce the biodiversity of the land. However, this has to be balanced with the need to provide additional employment land, particularly in the Keighley area. I consider that the requirement to provide additional employment sites in this area is sufficient to outweigh the residual impact on the biodiversity of this land.
- 5.62 In conclusion, I accept that there is merit in the Council's suggestion that these sites should be merged into one, especially as a comprehensive development scheme will be required. I consider that it would be premature to exclude from the developable area the land within the washlands, but any development proposals must be subject to the implementation of appropriate and acceptable flood mitigation and surface drainage measures. In addition, the protection of the SEGI and the creation of a buffer zone would be necessary. Accordingly, I recommend revised wording of the text under this heading.

## **Recommendation**

- 5.63 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the entries for K/E1.18 to K/E1.21 inclusive and substitution as follows:**

### **BEECHCLIFFE, KEIGHLEY**

**9.48 Ha.**

**An amalgamation of 4 sites carried forward from the Adopted UDP. A combination brownfield/greenfield site on the edge of the urban area, within the Hard Ings/Beechcliffe Employment Zone and a key site in the Strategic Development Corridor. A prime location for B1, B2 and B8 employment provision in support of the 2020 Vision. A comprehensive development scheme for the whole site is sought. This must take account of the need to protect and provide a buffer zone for the Beechcliffe Ings SEGI and the fact that 4.07 hectares of the site is within the washlands of the River Aire (functional flood plain, Zone 3c) in PPG25 Table 1). Development of this latter area can only take place if acceptable flood mitigation**

**measures are implemented. The site may be contaminated and will require a full contamination survey. Provision of an appropriate surface water drainage scheme will be required.**

**K/E1.22: Station Road, Oxenhope (SOM/K/H1/20)**

**Objectors**

889/497	<i>The Perseverance Mill Partnership</i>
1459/3257	<i>English Heritage</i>
4146/7170	<i>Skipton Properties Ltd</i>
4288/4923	<i>Mr Peter Hudman</i>

**Summary of Objections**

- The site should be allocated for mixed use or housing rather than employment.
- Development of this site would harm the character of the conservation area, and hence the land should remain undeveloped.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.64 I consider that the physical characteristics of most of the site make economically viable development somewhat difficult, and this may have contributed to the overall lack of interest in the site for employment use. Recent proposals, whilst including an element of employment-related use (nursing home and care home), have also sought a significant level of residential development.

5.65 In my view the site does not constitute a sustainable housing location in the terms of PPG3. Local services and facilities are limited, including public transport, and Oxenhope is not defined as a well-located settlement. Thus, despite the fact that part of the site constitutes previously-developed land, residential development here would not rank highly in terms of national, regional or local policy. I consider that this lack of local facilities is also a factor to be considered in the determination of proposals for accommodating elderly or partially immobile persons. Thus, allocation of the site for housing would be inappropriate.

5.66 Considerations similar to those above also apply to the allocation of the site as a mixed use area, where the supporting text of the RDDP makes it clear that Policy UR7 primarily applies to sites within the urban area. Whilst development of the site could help create vitality and diversity and reduce the need to travel, as advised in PPG1, in terms of Oxenhope this objective would be more readily achieved by employment development.

5.67 The character of the conservation area is primarily one of tightly-knit built development, mainly located to the west of the site. The site and its immediate environs form part of an area of generally open uses that are important in separating the main part of Oxenhope from nearby hamlets. I consider that built development on the north-western section of the site could be designed to preserve and indeed enhance the conservation area by providing a clear end to the main built-up area. Built development on the remaining section, however, would disrupt the sense of separation that is important to the character of this area.

5.68 Objections I refer to later in my report, under SOM/K/OS6/20/1, seek to have the land allocated for open space uses, particularly as allotment gardens. The physical characteristics of the site are not conducive to formal allotment use. However, removing this section of the site from the employment allocation would result in the creation of 2 areas each less than 0.4 hectares, and thus too small to show as individual allocations.

5.69 In these circumstances the site would be unallocated, and thus subject to Policies UR4 and OS8, as well as conservation area policies. I consider that this appropriately covers the circumstances relating to this site.

### **Recommendation**

**5.70 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of allocation K/E1.22.**

**SOM/K/E1/17: Keighley Road/Belton Road, Silsden (K/E1.4)**

### **Objector**

4191/11265 *Countryside Strategic Projects PLC*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The area allocated for employment should be revised in order to omit land within the functional floodplain of the River Aire.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.71 The Council has proposed that the area should be amended, together with the alignment of the proposed bypass, in order to exclude land within the functional floodplain. I agree with this alteration in principle but, as recorded in relation to reference K/E1.4 above, I consider that the employment allocation on that site should be deleted. Accordingly, no modification is required in relation to this particular objection.

### **Recommendation**

**5.72 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP, except as set out in relation to reference K/E1.4 above.**

**SOM/K/E1/22: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (K/E1.11)**

### **Objectors**

877/5746 *Miss W Jennings*  
882/5743 *Mrs M A Jennings*  
1106/5742 *Miss Allison Jennings*  
4567/10157 *Mr William Greene*

## Summary of Objections

- Employment development should be concentrated on the other proposed employment site in Ilkley, where nearby residents were previously aware of such use.
- Employment development should be restricted to a landscaped business park with a public thoroughfare.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.73 I have considered this matter in some detail in relation to reference K/E1.11 above. I have concluded that there is a shortage of good quality employment sites in Ilkley and that employment development on the Ashlands Road site is important to the sustainable development objectives of national, regional and local policy. In addition, the Backstone Way site (K/E1.10) has limitations in terms of vehicular access and cannot provide the range of sites needed in the area.

5.74 I note that the Ashlands Road site was previously allocated for housing development. However, I am satisfied that the provisions of the RDDP, as modified in accordance with my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11 above, should provide an attractive environment that would not harm the residential amenity of the area.

5.75 Concerning the nature of the proposed development of the site, I have already noted that the RDDP seeks to ensure that the development will contain publicly accessible open space and a cycleway, and I have recommended that mature trees on the site should be retained. I consider that these features should provide for the type of development that the objectors seek.

## Recommendation

**5.76 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than as set out in my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11 above.**

**SOM/K/E1/109: Land at Leeds Road, Ben Rhydding, Ilkley**

### Objectors

721/11221	<i>Mr Robert Alfred Tilley</i>
3858/10935	<i>Ilkley Civic Society</i>
4140/5609	<i>Rignet Limited</i>

## Summary of Objections

- There should be a planning brief for the disused garage, existing caravan storage and industrial units on this site.
- The site should be allocated for showroom, leisure, office, non-food retail or fast food.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.77 I have considered these objections in relation to SOM/K/CR7/109 and SOM/K/CL3/109 below, to which reference should be made.

## Recommendation

5.78 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.

**SOM/K/E1/238: Land at Bradford Road, Crossflatts, Bingley (SOM/K/GB1/238 & SOM/K/NR15/238)**

### Objector

4171/10123

*Mr George R Jowett*

### Summary of Objection

- The land should be allocated for employment under Policy E1, and the designation of Green Belt and washlands affecting the southern part of the site should be deleted.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.79 It was agreed by the Council's representative at the Inquiry that the northern half of the site was allocated as employment land in the adopted UDP and the Council accepted that that allocation should have been continued in the RDDP. The omission was considered to have been an oversight during the preparation of the Proposals Map. I have no reason to disagree with this view. The land has frontages to two main roads, adjoins employment uses, is available for development and is located within the strategic development corridor identified in the RDDP and the 2020 Vision.
- 5.80 In relation to the Green Belt designation, the line of the boundary does not relate to any identified feature on the ground - it simply cuts across the central section of the site. I understand that there was at some time in the past a fence line in this position, but this was removed some 20 years ago when a former spoil tip was removed. The Council's Green Belt Review survey form records that there is "no suitable boundary across the field". There is, therefore, no physical, visual or land use distinction between the land that the Council accepts should be allocated for employment and that within the Green Belt. The character and appearance of the land are similar, and that part designated as Green Belt plays no significant role in relation to the functions of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it.
- 5.81 I consider that the general and site-specific considerations relating to the review of the Green Belt are sufficient to provide the exceptional circumstances that warrant the removal of this land from the Green Belt. A defensible boundary is provided by the western and southern limits of the objection site, especially as they are in close proximity to the above-ground water mains that run immediately to the west, and the change in ground levels to the east and north.
- 5.82 Turning to the washlands designation, I understand from evidence given at other Inquiry sessions that the boundary is based upon information that is now some 50 years old. In this particular instance it has been stated that the ground levels of the site were altered some 15 years ago when a section of the A650 road was constructed, so that the site is now outside the floodplain of the River Aire. My site inspection confirmed that the site rises significantly from the levels of the land to the west and south. Furthermore, the information from the Environment Agency included with the Council's evidence shows

that the site was outside the area subject to flooding in November 2000, which I consider can be regarded as a good indication of the extent of the floodplain in this locality. Therefore, I conclude that the washlands designation is incorrect in including part of the objection site, and the Proposals Map should be amended accordingly.

## **Recommendation**

**5.83 I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:**

- [a] The site should be allocated for employment use under Policy E1.**
- [b] The designations of Green Belt and washlands on the Proposals Map should be deleted.**

**SOM/K/E1/352: Royd Ings Avenue, Keighley**

## **Objector**

1772/10372 *Lakeside Developments (Keighley) Ltd*

## **Summary of Objection**

- The land is allocated in the adopted UDP for employment use and lies within the strategic development corridor, adjoining an existing industrial estate and close to residential areas and public transport routes. It is available for development and there is a need for additional employment land, especially in the Keighley area where employment growth and business expansion is restricted by the lack of sites available for employment development.
- Allocation and development of this site for employment would provide the catalyst for the development of sites K/E1.18 - K/E1.21 inclusive, which suffer from constraints of access and multiple ownership that have prevented their development.
- Whilst the land lies within the functional floodplain of the River Aire, other land in the ownership of the objector can be used to provide compensatory flood and flow capacity in excess of that lost by development of the objection site, in accordance with a scheme already prepared and submitted to the Environment Agency.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.84 The land adjoins the Keighley Industrial Park, but at a significantly lower ground level and has been subject to flooding on a number of occasions, including November 2000. All parties agree that it is a strategic location for employment use but is located within the washlands defined in the RDDP. On the basis of advice from the Environment Agency and PPG25 the Council determined not to carry over the adopted UDP employment allocation into the RDDP. It is accepted that in this location the washlands essentially represent the functional floodplain of the River Aire.

5.85 National policy advice on these matters is included in PPG25, which was published in July 2001 following serious flooding throughout Britain, including the Aire Valley and the objection site. It emphasises the need for a precautionary and sequential approach to new development. It makes it clear that locations like the objection site fall within high-

- risk zone 3c), where built development should be wholly exceptional and limited to essential transport and utilities infrastructure that has to be there.
- 5.86 However, paragraph 31 of PPG25 refers to locations where extensive areas of land fall into the high-risk zones and further development may be needed in order to avoid social and economic stagnation or blight. It also states that in areas where alternative sites in lower-risk zones are not available, authorities should pay particular attention to design and mitigation issues. It has been claimed that this paragraph does not apply to zone 3c), but I can find no statement to that effect in PPG25.
- 5.87 The objector argues that the lack of available sites in Keighley has resulted in local businesses being unable to expand in the area, and potential new and in-coming businesses cannot be accommodated. The professional experience of agents and the views of local businesses were presented to support such assertion. Such evidence sought to demonstrate the prospect of social and economic blight in the area if development of the objection site (and K/E1.18 - K/E1.21) was not achieved.
- 5.88 It is also argued that most of the local alternative sites allocated for employment in the RDDP have constraints that would significantly restrict their development and/or make them unattractive to business occupiers. I note that PPG4 and PPG13 emphasise the need for development plans to take account of the requirements of business interests in providing for a choice of sites, particularly with good transport and communications links to customers, suppliers and workforce. I have inspected all such sites and accept that some are in less strategic locations and/or are not able to provide for a variety of individual user needs.
- 5.89 In terms of design and mitigation issues I note that the technical feasibility of providing adequate compensatory flood and flow capacity has been agreed between the Council and the objector. However, the Environment Agency maintains its objection in principle but did not appear at the Inquiry. Detailed consideration of the flood mitigation measures proposed indicates that the scheme would result in no increase in flooding upstream and downstream of the objection site and the land used to provide additional flood storage capacity. Within this latter area flood levels would be increased by only 10 mm. This difference is considered to be within the level of accuracy ascribed to available flood modelling techniques.
- 5.90 There are no significant built developments within this area that would be likely to be harmed by such a rise in flood levels - the area being essentially pastureland. Town planning decisions are predicated on the basis of "demonstrable harm", as set out in PPG1. I have no evidence that such harm would be caused by the suggested development provided that the proposed flood mitigation measures were implemented. The Environment Agency has made no substantive input to the deliberations of the Inquiry in this respect.
- 5.91 In these circumstances I consider that the proposed development can be justified as seeking to prevent social and economic stagnation where extensive areas of land fall into the high-risk zones and alternative sites in lower-risk zones are not available. I note that the agreed scheme of mitigation measures would provide a solution to the flood and flow problems that would be caused by development of the objection site. Furthermore, allocation of the site for employment purposes would be in line with the advice in PPG4 and PPG13.

5.92 I am aware that the advice in PPG25 is scheduled to be reviewed in 2005, and that the underlying factual basis for the identification of the washlands is somewhat old and has been shown to be incorrect in places. Similarly, the extent of the current Interim Floodplains Maps produced by the Environment Agency is in places considered questionable, and work is in progress to provide additional information. These uncertainties add to the case for allocating the land for employment use.

### **Recommendation**

5.93 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the allocation of the site for employment use under Policy E1, and that the supporting text make it clear that development is subject to the implementation of agreed flood mitigation measures.**

**SOM/K/E4/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

### **Objectors**

22/2100	<i>Mr Lawrence Wilson</i>
1742/3234	<i>Haworth Parish Council</i>
2438/2103	<i>Mr David Robertson-Brown</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The buildings should be retained for the use of the community, craft workshops and to preserve Haworth's heritage.
- There is a shortage of suitable sites for employment uses.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.94 Within the RDDP this site is no longer allocated as a phase 2 housing site. I have considered the site in relation to K/H2.34 below, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

5.95 **See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.34.**

**SOM/K/E5/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

### **Objectors**

4275/5799	<i>Miss J J Hamer</i>
4431/7459	<i>Mr M R Percival</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be preserved and used as a community base for business or community use and a gateway between the railway and the Main Street.



### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.96 Within the RDDP the land is no longer allocated as a phase 2 housing site. I have considered the site in relation to K/H2.34 below, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

5.97 **See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.34.**

**SOM/K/E6/74: Land at Hard Ings Road/Alston Road, Keighley**

### **Objector**

4142/5990 *Mr M Whiteley/Keighley Abattoir/Ondura Limited*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be removed from the Employment Zone, and allocated for non-food retail/showroom/fast food/leisure.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.98 I consider this objection in relation to SOM/K/CR7/74 below, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

5.99 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/E8/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

### **Objectors**

49/2093	<i>Ms Verity</i>
83/2095	<i>Mr John Scott</i>
123/2091	<i>Ms Anna K Scott</i>
948/3201	<i>Haworth Community Club</i>
1320/3205	<i>Mr K Shackleton</i>
1348/2097	<i>Mr Peter Sanderson</i>
1454/5233	<i>Mr Keith Brown</i>
1684/2096	<i>Ms Rachel Ann Lee</i>
2123/3390	<i>Mr Ian Palmer</i>
3116/7704	<i>Mrs Susan Burke</i>
3117/7697	<i>Mrs Olive Brown</i>
3397/7155	<i>Mr David Woodhouse</i>
4272/4981	<i>Mr Miles Marsden</i>
4275/4956	<i>Miss J J Hamer</i>
4355/7449	<i>Mrs Jane Sutcliffe</i>
4398/11022	<i>Mr Jeff Littlewood</i>
4560/7477	<i>Ms Barbara Combe</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should not be allocated for housing but should be used for community/tourist/small business use.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

5.100 Within the RDDP the site is no longer allocated for housing. I have considered the site in relation to K/H2.34 below, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

5.101 **See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.34.**

## Chapter 6 Housing

### PARAGRAPH 6.0

#### Objector

954/12860                      *Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber*

#### Summary of Objection

- It is difficult to understand how much greenfield land is being allocated because the constituency volumes do not contain this information for each site.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.1 In view of the importance of this information the site specific data in the constituency volumes should state whether each housing site is greenfield land or previously-developed land.

#### Recommendation

6.2 **I recommend the modification of the RDDP by the inclusion of information, for each housing site listed in the Keighley constituency volume, as to whether the site is a greenfield site or previously-developed land.**

### **K/H1.2 & SOM/K/GB1/75: Aireburn Avenue, Steeton with Eastburn, Keighley**

#### Objector

4075/10884 & 5982    *Mr M T Greaves*

#### Summary of Objections

- Development would represent ribbon development on what is an open hillside landscape that should be retained.
- The residential allocation should be removed and the land included in the Green Belt.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.3 The site is a slightly sloping grassed field fronting Keighley Road, situated between a ribbon of houses to the east and a small copse to the west. A stone wall marks the southern site boundary with the more steeply sloping hillside beyond being within the Green Belt. The site itself has never been designated as Green Belt. It was allocated for housing in the existing UDP and is a phase 1 allocation in the RDDP. However, the Council considers this phasing to have been an error and now suggests it should be a phase 2 allocation.

6.4 In terms of Policy H2 of RPG12 Steeton falls within the last criterion (excluding housing in rural areas) in the hierarchy of the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land. The site is relatively well-located with regard to a limited range of services,

facilities and employment, is within 800 metres of Steeton and Silsden station, and there is a half-hourly bus service to Keighley directly passing the site. The objection land is well contained and there is potential for it to be developed in depth. It would not extend beyond the present eastern edge of Steeton. Development would more readily visually link the existing housing in Aireburn Avenue to the rest of Steeton without, in my view, harmfully encroaching into the surrounding countryside. The present Green Belt boundary is clear and I have seen no exceptional reasons why this designation should be extended to the site. In light of RPG Policy H2, and my conclusions in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is a sufficiency in the phase 1 housing supply made up from sites higher up the sequential hierarchy, I consider that this site should be re-allocated for phase 2 housing.

### **Recommendation**

**6.5 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the re-allocation of the land as a phase 2 housing site.**

**K/H1.3: Hainsworth Road, Silsden, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- See under 3.0 at the beginning of this volume.
- This site is washland and regularly floods.
- The land should be included in a mixed use area with the neighbouring employment allocation, or the boundaries of the 2 allocations should be treated flexibly.
- This should be a safeguarded land allocation.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.6 I consider this site in relation to site reference H2.37 below, where I conclude against a housing allocation.

### **Recommendation**

**6.7 My recommendation is given under reference H2.37 below.**

**K/H1.8: Leeds Road, Ilkley**

### **Objectors**

3651/7652                      *Ilkley Design Statement Group*  
3858/3684                      *Ilkley Civic Society*  
4951/12250                      *Bradford Diocesan Board of Education*

## Summary of Objections

- Existing buildings should be converted rather than involving total new build.
- Concern over access to a new housing development.
- The school building is neither listed nor in a conservation area and its retention would prevent access to other parts of the site.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.8 The site of just over 0.5 hectares fronts onto the north-western side of Leeds Road close to Ilkley town centre. The site is now cleared of the previous All Saints' First School building and lock-up garages, leaving a cleared site save for one small lock-up shop fronting Leeds Road. There are no objections in principle to housing development on this previously-developed site, which is situated very close to the heart of the town in a very sustainable location. As the site has been cleared of the principal buildings the objections regarding the retention, or otherwise, of these are no longer relevant. In the RDDP land to the east of the former school site at the junction of Rivadale View and Bath Street has been added to the site. This, together with the site's clearance, should allow the creation of an adequate access to serve the whole site. I therefore consider that the site should remain as a phase 1 residential site. The justification for the allocation requires modifying to reflect the fact that the Victorian school building no longer exists.

## Recommendation

6.9 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion from the justification to the site's K/H1.8 allocation of the words:**

**“, preferably by a scheme that includes the sensitive conversion of the original Victorian school building”.**

**K/H1.9: Leeds Road, Ilkley (SOM/K/CF3/19, SOM/K/OS2/19, SOM/K/OS3/19 & SOM/K/GB1/19)**

## Objectors

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

## Summary of Objections

- There would be an adverse effect on a gateway into Ilkley, with loss of views and devaluation of property.
- The Scout and Guide headquarters re-located from Wheatley Lane could be accommodated on part of the site.
- Development should be on brownfield and not greenfield land or Green Belt.
- The land should be used as recreation space for the enlarged Ashlands School. Development of school playing fields conflicts with Government policy.
- Allowing development would be Council greed since increased rateable value would be achieved.
- There is a lack of affordable housing and school places in Ilkley.
- Very careful attention needs to be paid to the design of any cycleway.

- Parking associated with the 2 nearby schools would be exacerbated, with implications for safety.
- If developed, careful attention would be needed to preserve views of the moors and this should include setting development back from Leeds Road.
- There would be a loss of scarce green/recreation space and common land. There is no need for additional housing, the area being over-developed already.
- There are drawbacks with access to the site and there would be increasing congestion and noise on the A65, which is already at capacity.
- There should be an adequate buffer of planting to preserve privacy.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.10 This phase 1 allocated housing site has been carried forward from the existing UDP and is one of the few phase 1 sites within Ilkley/Ben Rhydding on which development has not started or is nearing completion. The site is not, and never has been, designated as Green Belt. It is a greenfield infill site within an urban area. The number of suitable previously-developed sites within Ilkley is very limited.
- 6.11 There is only a limited need to allocate any urban greenfield land for phase 1, particularly bearing in mind that an over-allocation would lead to the harmful development of more greenfield land. The reasoning and statistics leading up to this conclusion are explained in the Policy Framework volume of my report. However, in accordance with RPG Policy H2 it is necessary to test the comparative sustainability of the site.
- 6.12 Having regard to its location and accessibility to shops, facilities and services within the town centre I consider the site to be relatively well placed, with pedestrian access via good level footpaths. There is a supermarket on the edge of the town centre, within about 500 metres, with other local shops somewhat nearer. In relation to public transport regular bus services pass the site along Leeds Road and the majority of the site lies within 800 metres of Ilkley station. Two primary schools flank the site and Ilkley Grammar School is about 1.2km away. Open space, a playground, allotments and riverside footpaths are either adjacent or within 400 metres, and there is a small employment site to the opposite side of Leeds Road. I therefore consider that by comparison with other urban greenfield sites, such as those in Keighley, the objection land warrants its phase 1 allocation.
- 6.13 PPG17 states that existing open space should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space to be surplus to requirements. The Council undertook an audit of existing open spaces in 1998. This identified the site as a recreation open space. However, the Council states that the locality does not suffer from a deficiency of such provision. The site is not marked out with formal pitches and is not used on a regular basis for school purposes. Open land would remain to both the immediate east and west and would be protected under Policy OS3. Ashlands Primary School would still have sufficient land to accord with Department of Education and Skills guidelines for the playing of team games. This Department has given consent for the disposal of the K/H1.9 site. As a result, I do not consider allocation of the site for housing would conflict with the thrust of PPG17.
- 6.14 I concur with the Inspector's comments on this site when he considered objections to it within the context of the now adopted UDP, in respect of loss of character and town cramming: its retention as open space is not crucial to the area nor would its partial loss result in town cramming. Any development would be framed by retained open land to

both sides. It does not constitute a 'gateway' since in my view this implies something one would expect to see at the entrance to a particular area when coming from surroundings of a different character. The site is a piece of open land already within the urban form of Ilkley/Ben Rhydding. There are attractive views across the site towards the dramatic backdrop of Ilkley Moor but these would not be completely lost since there would remain a vista across the retained open land to the east. Furthermore, detailed design of the site could also ensure continuing views through the site.

- 6.15 A joint vehicular access serving Ashlands School and the site has already been formed from Leeds Road following planning permission in 2000. I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that the A65 is at capacity. However, traffic calming measures and new signalling are likely to be introduced in Ilkley and the site's relationship to public transport and other facilities should help to minimise the impact of additional traffic generated by development. There would be no requirement for vehicular access from the residential area to the south. Parking provision for the development would be a matter for consideration at the detailed planning stage. Accordingly, I do not consider that development on the site would be likely to result in traffic-related problems.
- 6.16 Landscaping and screening, layout, design and height of buildings, particularly in relation to Ashlands School, and the provision and alignment of any cycleways/footpaths through the site, would be matters to be addressed within a planning application. So too would the question of the provision of affordable housing, this being guided by Policy H9 of the Plan. I note the concerns of the Ilkley Civic Society that any development should be set back from Leeds Road by something in the order of 25 to 50 metres. Such a matter would also be dealt with when an application was made. Nevertheless, this site is specifically mentioned in the Ilkley Design Statement, in which comments are made about views of the moors over the site and the height and relationship of dwellings in relation to the school. In light of the size of the site, its presence within the public realm, and concerns expressed about detailed aspects of design, the Council may wish to consider the production of a specific design brief for the site to further guide its development.
- 6.17 The impact on rateable values and the possible devaluation of existing properties close by are not planning matters. Most new housing is likely to add pupils to school rolls. However, Policy UR6 indicates that conditions will be imposed on planning permissions, or obligations sought, to ensure the provision of necessary social infrastructure, which could include the enlargement of and/or the provision of new schools. The site is allocated to meet housing supply and the provision of a Scout and Guide headquarters and any associated land with this would reduce the contribution the site could make. Any proposal for such a use would be judged against plan Policies H3 and CF3. I have considered the question of the existing Scout and Guide headquarters at Wheatley Lane in connection with K/TM7.4. I have seen no evidence to suggest that extra space would be needed to enable Ashlands School to expand.
- 6.18 Overall, I consider that in locational terms this is an acceptable housing site and its allocation is necessary and reasonable to assist in meeting the Council's requirement to provide sufficient land for residential development within phase 1. I consider no modification to the RDDP is therefore necessary although, as mentioned above, the Council may wish to consider the production of a design brief to aid the site's beneficial development.

## **Recommendation**

6.19 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/H1.10: Bolling Road, Ben Rhydding, Ilkley (SOM/K/OS1/3, OS2/3, GB1/3, CF1/3, CF3/3, H1/3, OS3.3 and SOM/K/H1/3.1)**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- Loss of the playing field would be detrimental to the local community groups and school children that use the site regularly. Playing fields are scarce in Ben Rhydding and Ilkley. Children would need to be transported to other facilities thus creating traffic problems.
- Housing development would have an adverse impact on the local environment, landscape and wildlife. Brownfield land should be developed before greenfield sites.
- Government policy restricts development of school playing fields and the enlarged school will need more playing space.
- Development would be on the flattest, driest part of the playing field as a whole, effectively leaving the school with no outdoor sports facilities. The remaining land is unsuitable as a playing field as it is uneven and poorly drained. Development of part of the site could jeopardise the retention of the remainder of the playing field.
- There would be increased traffic, pollution, congestion and road safety problems on Bolling Road.
- Building work could disrupt school work.
- The Scout and Guide headquarters from Wheatley Lane could be accommodated on part of the site.
- There would be loss of views of the surrounding valley.
- The RDDP states that small open areas within the urban form should be protected.
- Development is unjustified and there is no information about the number of dwellings to be built.
- The site should be allocated as Recreation Open Space, urban greenspace or Green Belt.
- There are no planned improvements to infrastructure.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.20 The site comprises about a quarter of a larger area of maintained, grassed public open space to the north side of Bolling Road. It is actively used as public open space and for outdoor recreation by the nearby Ben Rhydding Primary School. The housing allocation has been deleted in the RDDP as the Council considered that sufficient housing land had been identified in phase 1 of the plan in light of the proposed higher density assumptions of RPG12. The site was therefore added to the rest of the public open space and protected under Policy OS3.

6.21 PPG17 states that existing open space should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space to be surplus to requirements. I have been presented with no evidence that such an assessment showing the land to be surplus has been undertaken. Certainly the objectors' comments would appear to indicate



that, locally, the site in its present form is perceived to be of considerable use and value. The vast majority of objections related to the site's allocation for housing and many have now been formally withdrawn. As I concur with the Council's proposed OS3 allocation I do not consider further those objections relating to the earlier housing allocation.

- 6.22 Urban greenspaces, as defined in the RDDP, are significant areas of open space in terms of their size and prominence within the urban area and are protected under Policy OS1. Whilst open in character I do not consider the objection land either with or without the balance of the field would fall within this category. As I also agree that in respect of the rest of the playing field this is correctly categorised as being protected under Policy OS3, it would make little sense for the present objection site, which is not distinguished from the larger field, to benefit from a different protective policy.
- 6.23 The site falls within the midst of an urban area and fulfils none of the purposes or functions of the Green Belt. It would not therefore be correct to designate it as such. Any proposal for the re-siting of the Scout and Guide headquarters would be assessed against Policies CF3 and OS3 and it would be inappropriate to make any specific designation for this. Furthermore, I have considered the question of the Scout headquarters in respect of K/TM7.4.
- 6.24 It is therefore my overall view that no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.25 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/H1.11 & SOM/K/CF1/23:Valley Drive, Ilkley**

#### **Objectors**

983/539	<i>Mr William Boocock</i>
2765/11028 & 11030	<i>Mrs A Thompson</i>
2768/10373 & 10761	<i>Mr Andrew D Walbank</i>
3561/3732	<i>Mr A J MacPherson</i>
3651/7655	<i>Ilkley Design Statement Group</i>
3858/3682	<i>Ilkley Civic Society</i>
4255/10377 & 10765	<i>Ilkley Parish Council</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The Middle School should continue as a sixth form college or Lower Grammar School and should not be used for housing.
- The school should not be disposed of until it is absolutely certain that no new school will be required in Ilkley to cater for the growing number of school children.
- There is a need for expansion of Further Education and the site could provide much needed facilities for young people.
- Removal of school use will put further pressure on school places.
- Development will increase traffic and exacerbate problems. Access should be carefully considered in order to avoid rat runs.
- Development would interrupt existing views.
- There should be retention of existing hedges and trees.

- The Wharfedale Cycleway should be taken through or adjacent to the proposed housing allocation.
- Housing should be permitted only within the footprint of the existing school building and should be limited to bungalow height.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.26 This rectangular site comprises the former Ilkley Middle School and its immediately surrounding grounds, whilst its associated playing field to the east is proposed to be protected under Policy OS3. (I have considered objections to this latter site under K/OS3.2). As the school is considered surplus to educational requirements by the Education Authority the site represents a previously-developed site within the urban area of Ilkley. It therefore falls within the first category in the sequential approach to site selection of Policy H2 of RPG12. The site is in a sustainable location lying within convenient access of a range of shops and services, being within 400 –500 metres of Ben Rhydding station, and having a bus route passing along Valley Drive.
- 6.27 Of particular concern to a number of objectors is whether other schools in Ilkley have adequate capacity without there being a continuing requirement for this school. From the detailed information provided I am satisfied that this is the case. The Education Authority has also indicated that, should the Grammar School ever need to expand, this middle school site would not be considered as it is too small to accommodate a large 11 – 19 school. I therefore do not consider there to be a need for the school site to be safeguarded for possible future educational use.
- 6.28 I am satisfied that it would be possible to create a suitable access to the site and that its development is unlikely to materially increase problems of highway safety. Retention of views, and hedges and trees within the site, together with the layout, form and type of dwellings, would be matters to be addressed at the detailed planning stage, as would the provision of any cycle route through the site. I therefore consider there are no substantive reasons why the site should not remain as a phase 1 housing allocation.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.29 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/H1.15: Bradford Road, Riddlesden, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

4527/9970 *Mr John Dallas*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- Development would create a tunnel of housing and there should be retention of the present gap to allow views across the valley.
- Development would be contrary to the Council's Corporate Environment Policy of January 1998.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.30 This grassed rectangular site has a frontage of about 120 metres to Bradford Road and is flanked and faced by ribbons of residential development. It is a greenfield site within the urban area of Keighley and has been carried forward from the adopted UDP. Having regard to Policy H2 of RPG12 the site falls within the policy's second category in the sequential approach to housing land allocation - that of infill within an urban area, following previously-developed land and conversions within such areas.
- 6.31 I consider the site is a modest gap in what is a substantially built-up frontage along the southern side of Bradford Road. It serves no particular purpose in maintaining separation between settlements, unlike the much larger gap further to the south-east considered under SOM/K/GB1/218 below. To my mind there is no particular value in the maintenance of limited views from Bradford Road over the valley floor towards Keighley. The objector has not elaborated on his belief that there would be conflict with the Council's Corporate Environment Policy. One of the principal sources of guidance on retaining land as open and undeveloped is that provided in PPG2. The site has never been included within the Green Belt and I do not consider there are any exceptional circumstances for so including the land now. I therefore consider that the site is in principle one which should be allocated for housing.
- 6.32 Nevertheless, the site is realistically on the fringes of Keighley and in sustainability terms is only moderately placed, being over 2km from Keighley station and having only a limited range of services and facilities within easy walking distance, although a 10-minute frequency bus service does pass along Bradford Road. I am recommending the allocation of other, more sustainable, urban greenfield sites to make up the phase 1 requirement. Consequently, I do not consider that the objection land should be allocated within phase 1 but should instead become a phase 2 site. The RDDP therefore requires modification to this effect.

## Recommendation

- 6.33 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting the site's phase 1 housing allocation and re-allocating it as a phase 2 housing site.**

## SOM/K/H1/3: Bolling Road, Ilkley (K/H1.10)

### Objectors

758/4650	<i>Mrs Joyce M White</i>
904/5228	<i>Mr E R Varley</i>
979/5227	<i>Mrs G Harris</i>

### Summary of Objections

- The land is a necessary amenity area. If it is considered that houses must be built here then it should be on the section next to the railway line.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.34 I have considered objections to this site in relation to K/H1.10 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

6.35 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/3.01: Land at Bolling Road, Ilkley (Site A)**

### **Objector**

4382/10915 *Mrs Anne Oddy*

### **Summary of Objection**

- Development on the playing field is not supported at all but if it is necessary to build houses this should be on a narrow strip adjacent to the railway.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.36 The objection land is allocated as playing fields, protected under Policy OS3. The objector clearly does not welcome development on the land at all but has suggested an alternative to the housing site K/H1.10 suggested in the FDDP, but dropped from the RDDP. This would be a narrow strip of land that would require access across the balance of the playing field site. I consider development on the site suggested would be likely to be impractical as well as disruptive to the functioning of the playing field. I have also concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is a sufficiency in the supply of phase 1 housing. Consequently, I do not consider any modification to the RDDP to be necessary.

### **Recommendation**

6.37 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/19: Leeds Road, Ilkley (K/H1.9)**

### **Objector**

3872/10997 *Mr Kenneth A Wardell*

### **Summary of Objection**

- Development on the site K/H1.9 should not go ahead in its suggested form. A smaller area further from existing residential property should be considered, thereby maintaining a much larger recreational area.
- There would be a loss of virtually the only remaining green recreational area on this side of Ilkley.
- Development would be very disturbing for the elderly residents of St Mary's Close.

- There would be increased parking problems associated with the schools, and access difficulties.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.38 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H1.9 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

6.39 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/20: Station Road, Oxenhope (K/E1.22)**

#### **Objectors**

889/4647                      *The Perseverance Mill Partnership*  
4146/7169                      *Skipton Properties Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be allocated for housing under Policy H1 instead of employment.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.40 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.22 above. Whilst I conclude that allocation for employment use is inappropriate I also find that housing would be unacceptable in this location.

### **Recommendation**

6.41 **My recommendation is given under reference E1.22 above.**

### **SOM/K/H1/21: Hainsworth Road, Silsden (K/H2.37)**

#### **Objector**

4191/11279                      *Countryside Strategic Projects PLC*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- This should be reinstated as a phase 1 site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.42 I conclude below, under reference H2.37, that the site should not be allocated for housing at all. It follows that I do not agree with this objection asking for the site to be brought forward.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.43 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP in response to this specific objection.**

### **SOM/K/H1/21.01: Part of site at Hainsworth Road, Silsden (KH2.37)**

#### **Objector**

4119/12575 *Lattice Property Holdings Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The north-western part of the large Hainsworth Road site is previously developed land which is capable of being developed independently for phase 1 housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.44 This former gas works is indeed previously-developed land but the site is too small (less than 0.4 hectares) to be shown on the Proposals Map as an allocation. If it could be developed independently it would become a windfall site. See below for my conclusions regarding the possible Green Belt designation of the Hainsworth Road site, which are relevant to this piece of land.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.45 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP in response to this specific objection.**

### **SOM/K/H1/22: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (K/E1.11)**

#### **Objectors**

2058/2111 *Mr F & Mrs H Thornton*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be developed for affordable housing instead of employment.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.46 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.11 above, where I conclude that the land is appropriately allocated for employment.
- 6.47 I am aware that the land was previously allocated for housing, and that it is in a sustainable location where housing would be acceptable. However, the location is also eminently suitable for employment uses, for which there is restricted land availability in Ilkley. I have been presented with no compelling evidence of the local need for affordable housing, but there is a strong case for additional employment land in the area. I conclude, therefore, that the land is appropriately allocated for employment use in

pursuance of the sustainable development objectives of national, regional and local policy.

### **Recommendation**

6.48 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than as set out in my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11.**

**SOM/K/H1/23: Valley Drive, Ilkley (K/H1.11)**

### **Objector**

2765/11029 *Mrs A Thompson*

### **Summary of Objection**

- Further development would exacerbate traffic and highway safety problems, lead to further pressure on school places and block views.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.49 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H1.11 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

6.50 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/34: Hollins Lane, Utley, Keighley (K/H2.21)**

### **Objectors**

4221/12651 *Messers TSS and GL Black*  
4224/12652 *Exors of A R Illingworth Decd*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be re-allocated as a phase 1 housing site.
- Infrastructure improvements would benefit the area in general in addition to opening up the site for development.
- The allocation of the land for housing should include field No. 8749 to the south-west and that part of field No. 9259, which is not presently included.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.51 Within the FDDP the site was allocated as a phase 2 housing site but this was changed within the RDDP to safeguarded land. I have considered the site in relation to K/UR5.24 above, to which reference should be made. The allocation of field No. 8749 and the additional part of field No. 9259 has been considered in relation to SOM/K/GB1/113 below.

## **Recommendation**

**6.52 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/35: Shann Lane, Blackhill, Keighley (K/H2.22)**

### **Objector**

3839/12563 *Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be allocated for either phase 1 or phase 2 housing and not safeguarded land.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.53 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H2.22 below, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

**6.54 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.25 and its substitution as a phase 2 housing site.**

**SOM/K/H1/36: North Dean Ave, Braithwaite, Keighley (K/H2.23, K/UR5.26 and SOM/K/GB1/36)**

### **Objectors**

4225/12646 *Mr & Mrs K Marshall*  
5022/12676 *Goldfinch (Projects) Ltd*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site, which is now allocated in the RDDP as safeguarded land under Policy UR5, should be reallocated as a Policy H1 housing site.
- The ecological value of parts of the site, the value of the hedgerows and the legitimacy of the footpaths is disputed.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.55 These conclusions should be read in conjunction with those relating to objections to the same site under K/UR5.26, K/H2.23 and SOM/K/GB1/36. This site of some 6.73 hectares comprises a series of pasture fields sloping generally southwards from Braithwaite Village to the valley of the North Beck. To the east the site is flanked by housing along North Dene Avenue. It was allocated as a housing site in the adopted UDP and as a phase 2 site in the FDDP.



- 6.56 My general conclusions regarding the housing strategy of the RDDP are set out in the Policy Framework volume of this report. In this I have concluded that there is an adequacy of land for housing within phase 1 of the plan made up largely from previously-developed land and conversions and land within the urban areas. I have also agreed that there is a need to safeguard land to ensure the permanency of the Green Belt beyond the end of the plan period. Safeguarded land should be genuinely capable of development when needed. I have no evidence to suggest that there are any insuperable constraints affecting the site, a now lapsed planning permission having been granted for residential development in 1991.
- 6.57 Whilst I have also concluded that there is a shortfall in housing provision within phase 2 I do not consider it would be appropriate to reduce this by allocating this particular site. The land would be a greenfield extension on the edge of Keighley. Although close to bus routes and within ready walking distance of schools and a limited range of other facilities, it is relatively remote from the town centre and, as considered in respect of K/H2.23, development on the whole site could harm the setting of Braithwaite Conservation Area. Therefore, in sustainability terms the site is not well placed.
- 6.58 The Council has identified a hedgerow, stream and 2 wet flushes within the site as being of local habitat value and I have no reason to dispute this. There is also a definitive public footpath crossing the southern third of the site. Protection or incorporation of these features would be matters for detailed consideration within the context of a planning application.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.59 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/38 & K/OS7.7: Off Lees Lane (North), Haworth (K/H2.31 & SOM/K/OS1/38)**

#### **Objector**

4146/12583/84      *Skipton Properties Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site has merit as a housing allocation, is not affected by constraints, and should be allocated as a phase 1 site, or, failing this, a phase 2 or safeguarded land site.
- The site is within the settlement and would capitalise on infrastructure and decontamination investment made in relation to the adjoining housing site.
- The site performs no Green Belt function and is not important to the character, visual amenity or local identity of Haworth or the setting of Ebor Mills, and has no recreation value.
- The site does not fulfil the PPG17 criteria for designation as village greenspace.
- The site is reasonably placed having regard to public transport.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.60 Within the adopted UDP the site was partially included within the Green Belt but, together with other adjoining land, was removed from it and the site itself was allocated

as a phase 2 site within the FDDP. In the RDDP the site is allocated as village greenspace, protected under Policy OS7.

6.61 The site lies at a slightly lower level than land to the north-west that is within the Green Belt. It will be contained by existing residential curtilages and by those of future housing on the site where planning permission has been implemented to the south-east. Once development is completed on land to the south-east I do not consider that the site is likely to be particularly prominent from Lees Lane. However, it is seen from viewpoints on Hebden Road to the south and from across the valley within Haworth. I consider that in these views, as well as more immediately from land to the north-west, it makes a significant contribution to the setting of this part of the village. It also assists in the setting of Ebor Mills, a listed building, and the imposing Longlands to the north-east, now a youth hostel. If my recommendation regarding SOM/K/H1/241 is accepted it would be a part of the much wider open area of greenspace extending up both sides of the valley between Haworth and Lees. In terms of PPG17 I consider that the site positively contributes to both the quality of the settlement form and general visual amenity. In my view the site is correctly identified as village greenspace.

6.62 Haworth is not part of the urban area, where development should be concentrated in accordance with over-arching policy. There is a sufficiency in the supply of phase 1 housing land made up from more sustainable sites. In my view the contribution of the site to any identified shortfall in the supply of land within phase 2, or in the amount of safeguarded land, would not outweigh the site's importance as a village greenspace allocation. Nor is the fact that the site could make use of the infrastructure that has been provided within the adjacent housing site a sufficient reason for the site's allocation for housing. I therefore consider that no modification to the RDDP is required.

### **Recommendation**

6.63 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/39: Off Lees Lane (South), Haworth (K/H2.32 & K/UR5.32)**

### **Objector**

4146/12582 *Skipton Properties Ltd*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.64 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H2.32 below, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

6.65 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site's safeguarded land designation K/UR5.32.**

**SOM/K/H1/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

**Objector**

4398/11021 *Mr Jeff Littlewood*

**Summary of Objection**

- The old school building should not be demolished and built upon, but should be used for community use, or even flats as a last resort.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.66 Whilst allocated for housing within the FDDP, the land is unallocated within the RDDP. I have considered the site in relation to K/H2.34 below, to which reference should be made.

**Recommendation**

6.67 **See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.34.**

**SOM/K/H1/42: Sycamore Grove, Steeton with Eastburn (K/UR5.3)**

**Objectors**

17/2027 *Mrs C E Parker*  
713/2026 *Mr J Thompson*  
1248/2021 *The Lloyd Family*  
1382/2024 *Mr and Mrs P Lloyd*

**Summary of Objections**

- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site rather than being safeguarded.
- The site is in a sustainable location and has no constraints to its development. Further housing will be needed as nearby employment areas and the Airedale Hospital expand.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.68 Part of this safeguarded land site was allocated for housing within the adopted UDP in conjunction with land to its western side where development has taken place (K/H1.1). The present site comprises parts of 3 fields, none of the land having been designated as Green Belt. I consider above the status of Steeton with Eastburn in the sequential approach to housing allocations (see site K/UR5.2).

6.69 I have considered the general amount and distribution of housing allocations in the Policy Framework volume of this report where I have concluded that there is a sufficiency in the supply of phase 1 housing land made up from sites which are more appropriate.

6.70 I acknowledge that there are no apparent constraints to the development of the land and that it was envisaged by the developer of K/H1.1 that housing on the eastern part of the objection land would be a logical second stage of this development. Nevertheless, the

planning policy background against which I need to judge these matters is different to that pertaining at the time of the last UDP Inquiry, and these arguments are not sufficient to outweigh the broader locational considerations that now apply. I therefore consider there is no requirement for the objection land to be allocated as a phase 1 housing site and no modification to the RDDP is warranted.

## **Recommendation**

**6.71 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/95 & SOM/K/GB1/95: Land at Halifax Road, Hermit Hole, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

2524/5579 & 5581 *Albany View Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.72 Although there is sporadic residential development to the west, south and east I consider the Green Belt boundary within this area to be clearly defined, the site lying within the Green Belt and not on its edge. The Green Belt performs an important function in this location by helping to prevent further linear sprawl of development along Halifax Road and maintaining the separation between southern Keighley and Cross Roads to the south-west. It also serves to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. I consider that all these purposes would be compromised if this open site were to be allocated and developed for residential purposes.

6.73 The land is not in my view an infill or rounding-off site, being flanked by an open field to the north, and wooded slopes, and development would result in a loss of openness of the Green Belt. There is no compelling evidence to suggest why this area in general is in need of regeneration or how allocating this particular site for housing would materially help to achieve this. Although in locational terms the site might have some sustainable attributes it is nonetheless a greenfield site beyond the edge of the urban area of Keighley and would not accord well with policies relating to the location of residential development. Because it is not on the edge of the Green Belt the site would, if it were to be allocated for housing, necessitate the release of a greater area of land from the Green Belt. I do not consider that there are any exceptional circumstances that justify the removal of the site from the Green Belt.

## **Recommendation**

**6.74 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/H1/96 & SOM/K/GB1/96: Land at Providence Lane, Oakworth**

### **Objector**

2519/5582 & 5583 *M & P Agencies Retirement Trust*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.75 Oakworth is not part of the main urban area and is classified as a less well-located settlement. Accordingly, it ranks low in the sequence of the locational strategy of the RDDP and RPG12. Whilst it contains a variety of local services and facilities these are some distance from the objection site, and bus services along Providence Lane are not of high frequency. I have no compelling evidence of local housing need and I consider that the settlement already contains a significant proportion of new housing in peripheral locations.

6.76 I accept that access could be obtained from the adjoining housing development, but the site forms an important part of the Green Belt in this location. However the site is a field on visually prominent sloping ground. Development here would result in urban sprawl and encroachment into the countryside that would significantly harm the separation of Oakworth and Haworth. I consider that this part of the Green Belt is particularly sensitive, and further development would result in great harm to the character and appearance of this part of the Worth Valley, causing a material loss of openness.

6.77 I do not consider that there are any exceptional circumstances that justify the removal of the site from the Green Belt, nor are there reasons to support the provision of an additional housing site in this location.

### **Recommendation**

6.78 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/H1/97 & SOM/K/GB1/97: Land at Hainworth Crag Road, Keighley**

### **Objector**

2524/5584 & 5585 *Albany View Ltd*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The Green Belt boundary should be amended to allow the site to be developed for residential use.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.79 The site lies at the south-eastern edge of Keighley and comprises sloping wooded land bisected by a private track serving residential properties to the north-east of the site. It is

designated as Green Belt within the adopted UDP and no change is proposed within the RDDP. The site is close to that considered under SOM/K/H1/95 above for which the objectors have made the same case. The conclusions I have drawn in respect of that site are equally applicable to this.

## **Recommendation**

**6.80 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/98 & SOM/K/GB1/98: High Wheathead Farm, Wheathead Lane, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

3920/5586 & 5587 *Mr David Wood*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The poor quality farm buildings should be removed from the Green Belt and the site developed for housing or allocated as safeguarded land.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.81 The objection land comprises a farm house, associated farm buildings, access roads and hardstandings lying to the south of the completed residential site K/H1.33. This housing allocation and the present Green Belt boundary bisect the collection of barns and hardstandings at the farm so that a substantial proportion of these remain within the housing site.
- 6.82 I agree with the Council's concession that the site performs rather weakly in terms of serving Green Belt purposes. Furthermore, I do not consider there to be a great deal of logic in the manner in which the present boundary is drawn, incorporating effectively half a farmyard and buildings within a housing allocation and the other half remaining in the Green Belt. The proposed Green Belt boundary would follow a post and wire fence. Although it could be argued that this does not represent a particularly robust or permanent feature, it does coincide with a break in the slope of the land so that the present buildings are largely contained within the landscape. I consider this would provide a defensible boundary, with little danger of future encroachment onto land to the south, and is as logical as some of the boundaries that the Council has seen fit to draw elsewhere.
- 6.83 I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is a sufficiency in the supply of phase 1 housing sites made up from sites with planning permissions and those within the urban areas. I have identified a shortfall in the phase 2 supply. The objection land represents a greenfield extension to the urban form of Keighley but I consider that the site performs poorly in sustainability terms. It is remote from shops, services and most facilities, although there is a bus service within Wheathead Lane within ready walking distance.
- 6.84 The site does not accord well with advice regarding the allocation of housing land. I am not convinced by the argument that substitution of the remaining farm buildings with housing would obviate potential nuisance from noise and smell. I assume that planning

permission of the existing housing development was granted in the knowledge that these buildings could remain and environmental health powers could control these matters. Overall, I do not consider the site is a contender to help make up the shortfall in phase 2 provision.

6.85 However, I have also identified a considerable shortfall in safeguarded land provision. I have recommended that a full-scale review of the Green Belt take place to ensure that sufficient safeguarded land is encompassed to provide for housing needs well beyond the plan period. For this reason, the poor existing Green Belt boundary, and the failure to fulfil Green Belt purposes, there are exceptional circumstances for amending the Green Belt boundary. Nevertheless, this is a very small site and I consider that its allocation as safeguarded land at this stage would not serve to prejudice any future review the Council might undertake.

### **Recommendation**

6.86 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Green Belt designation and the substitution of a designation as safeguarded land.**

### **SOM/K/H1/99 & SOM/K/GB1/99: Branshaw Plantation, Slaymaker Lane, Oakworth**

#### **Objectors**

4257/5588 & 5589 *Messrs G S Lund and J N Lund*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing since the RDDP does not provide land for large dwellings set within large gardens.
- The robustness of the Green Belt boundary is not evident from within the site.
- Development would be a natural extension to Oakworth without being obtrusive and there is evidence that residential development was started on the site in the 1950s.
- A positive planting scheme would be of benefit to the area and development would remove the problem of fly tipping.
- Traffic on Slaymaker Lane is light and access to the land could be constructed.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.87 The site forms part of the larger Branshaw Plantation, lying to the north-eastern edge of Oakworth and all of which falls within the Green Belt. It is bounded by Slaymaker Lane to its west and Back Wright Avenue to its south, and a golf course to the east. There is no distinguishing boundary to the north to differentiate the site from the rest of the plantation, which comprises predominantly mature woodland.

6.88 Oakworth is not part of the urban area and ranks low in the locational strategy of the RDDP and RPG12. I have no compelling evidence of local housing need or that for larger dwellings set within sizeable gardens. The site has had a long-standing designation as Green Belt, pre-dating that in the adopted UDP. PPG2 advises that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally and that boundaries should be well-defined.

- 6.89 Although the site has been cleared in the past it is now covered by largely self-seeded trees of some maturity. It forms part of an attractive wooded area extending to both sides of Slaymaker Lane, which I consider clearly forms part of the countryside setting for this northern part of Oakworth. The Green Belt boundary is well-defined along Back Wright Avenue by a tall stone wall. The suggested revised boundary to the north is arbitrary and not well-defined, following no particular physical features. Residential development on the site, even if of very low density with many retained trees and supplementary planting, would represent a harmful encroachment into this countryside setting and would serve to reduce the openness of the Green Belt.
- 6.90 I do not consider that there are any exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of the site from the Green Belt, nor are there any reasons to support the provision of additional housing on it.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.91 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/102 & SOM/K/UR4/102: Opposite Oak Garth, Cheltenham Avenue, Ben Rhydding, Ilkley**

#### **Objectors**

4127/5594 & 5595 *Wrights Trustees*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- There is a need for additional residential land to be identified in the UDP.
- The site is well related to the urban form.
- It meets the size threshold for the allocation of residential sites.
- The site is suitable for development and is genuinely available.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.92 Measuring just over 0.4 hectares the site is for the most part overgrown, vacant grassland situated at the eastern end of Cheltenham Avenue. At its north-western corner the site also comprises part of the maintained garden of No. 39 Cheltenham Avenue. The Council has indicated that it is not normal custom to allocate land actively used as private garden and that if this were to be discounted then the site's area would fall below the 0.4 hectare threshold that has been adopted for allocating land in the plan. It is a greenfield unallocated site on the edge of Ben Rhydding/Ilkley with the Green Belt forming the majority of its eastern boundary and a railway line its northern boundary. In terms of the urban form of the settlement I agree that residential development here would represent an acceptable form of rounding-off.
- 6.93 I have dealt with the question of the overall supply of residential land in the Policy Framework volume of this report. As far as the sustainability of the site's location is concerned it is well related to Ben Rhydding station and a limited range of shops, and would be within the 1.5 kilometre walking distance of a secondary school. However, it is beyond the walking threshold of a primary school and of 10-minute frequency bus services, and is remote from the town centre. In addition, and despite the availability of



the site for development, I consider that a fundamental constraint on the site's allocation is the inadequacy of access to it.

6.94 The site was subject to a planning application for 4 dwellings in 2000 and, following the Council's refusal of permission, an appeal was dismissed the following year. The Inspector noted that the privately maintained Cheltenham Avenue was seriously inadequate because of surfacing, lack of footpaths, drainage and lighting, and substandard visibility splays at its junction with Wheatley Avenue. Additional traffic generated by development would increase the risk of accidents to both road users and pedestrians. I have been presented with no evidence to persuade me that the previous Inspector's conclusions on the inadequacy of access to the site are no longer valid. Indeed, were the site to be allocated, PPG3 advice and the Council's own Policy H7 of the RDDP would dictate that the number of dwellings on the site would be likely to be far higher than the 4 units previously proposed. To my mind this would imply greater volumes of traffic visiting the site thereby increasing the identified highway disadvantages. I consider that inadequacy of access arrangements is a compelling reason for not allocating this site for residential purposes and these outweigh any locational advantages it might have.

### **Recommendation**

6.95 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/110 & SOM/K/GB1/110: Land at Back Beck Lane, Addingham (SOM/K/GB1/110)**

#### **Objector**

4150/5610 & 5611 *Mrs M Johnson*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site.
- It would create a more logical settlement boundary to the village and development could be regarded as infill if housing takes place on the adjacent former school site.
- A limited and sensitively designed scheme would assist in reducing social and policing problems associated with the adjacent old railway bridge.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.96 I have considered the RDDP's major extension to the Green Belt around the north of Addingham in relation to K/GB1.4 where I have accepted the Council's argument that there are exceptional circumstances why this should take place. The objection land is a small grassed field with frontage to Back Beck Lane and is part of this wider tranche of Green Belt. Whilst a tall but partially dilapidated stone wall marks the field's northern edge and could have formed the Green Belt boundary, I consider the Council's chosen boundaries in the vicinity of the site to be logical and robust. In my view the field fulfils the Green Belt purposes of preventing the northward sprawl of the village and of protecting what is attractive open countryside which extends right into the village. It is therefore my view that the objection land is correctly included within the Green Belt.

- 6.97 In terms of the sequential approach of Policy H2 of RPG12 Addingham as a settlement warrants a low priority for the allocation of housing. It is a rural settlement with no railway station and where the frequency of bus service is insufficient to warrant the village having the description of a location with good public transport. In my view housing provision here should be to meet local needs and/or support local services. In achieving this, priority should be given to the re-use of previously-developed land and buildings and conserving (and where possible enhancing) character.
- 6.98 I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that there is a need to allocate this site to help meet local needs, especially when the nearby former school site is allocated and will use previously-developed land. Furthermore, I consider that development on the site would detract from the rural charm of this part of Back Lane and would do nothing to conserve or enhance the character of the village. Even if development were to take place on the former school site the general openness of this area of Back Lane would mean that housing on the objection land, with its road frontage of about 75 metres, would not constitute limited infill.
- 6.99 Whilst design can be used to mitigate the opportunities for crime the policing of anti-social behaviour is not a matter to be addressed within the UDP. Besides which, I have no evidence of the level or severity of any such problems. In my view there are no exceptional circumstances why this site should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated as an additional housing site.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.100 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/111 & SOM/K/OS7/111: Land at Manor Garth, Addingham**

#### **Objector**

4150/5612 & 5613 *Mrs M Johnson*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- This site found favour as a housing site with the previous Inspector and is so allocated in the adopted UDP.
- A housing development could be designed to retain the majority of the open area, to preserve the character of the conservation area and to preserve the settings of listed buildings.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.101 Since the previous Inspector reported national policy has been altered, and, in particular, the new regional guidance RPG12 has been published. This guidance contains Policy H2. As I have said in relation to SOM/K/H1/110 above, in the sequential approach of this policy Addingham as a settlement warrants a low priority for the allocation of housing land. It is in a rural area where housing provision should be to meet local needs and/or support local services. The fact that house prices are increasing locally is not adequate evidence that the objection land should be allocated for these reasons.

6.102 Manor Garth is an open space within the Addingham Conservation Area. Allocation is sought for only the south-eastern part but this shares with the remainder a function as a visual break between the old village core and newer development to the north. In terms of the use of the land, I note the evidence that a hay crop has been taken this year. The open land brings a countryside character right up to the village centre. Development of part of the garth would restrict this function by reducing the area of open land. Some element of the views of The Rookery, a listed building, would be lost too, even though design and layout could retain the views from parts of the site. In terms of the new version of PPG17, published since the adopted UDP was examined, the objection land provides a visual amenity. In the light of the sequential approach which the RDDP should be taking to the allocation of housing land, there is no need for Addingham to lose the contribution which the objection site makes to the village.

6.103 The part of Manor Garth that the objection proposes for housing is subject to flooding, and this adds a further substantial argument against allocation. Archaeological interests could be protected by a requirement to evaluate, and to excavate if necessary before development, and views out of the village could be preserved. Nevertheless, there are strong reasons why the site should not be allocated for housing, but should be identified as village greenspace. These reasons against development outweigh the improvements to recreational provision which could accompany development.

### **Recommendation**

6.104 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/112 & SOM/K/GB1/112: Land at Main Street, Addingham**

#### **Objector**

4150/5614 & 5615 *Mrs M Johnson*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The Green Belt allocation of the land is inappropriate as it makes no effective contribution to the character of this part of the village.
- The site should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site with specific reference to 'home-working'.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.105 This rectangular pasture field lies to the immediate south-western side of Main Street and forms part of the tract of Green Belt which extends up to the road on this side of the village. The Council suggested the land was suitable for employment purposes as part of a larger site in the First Deposit of the now adopted UDP. However, this allocation was changed and the land returned to the Green Belt on the recommendation of the Inspector following the Public Inquiry.

6.106 I agree that the site contributes to the separating function of the Green Belt between Addingham, Ilkley, Silsden and Keighley. It helps prevent the sprawl of the village, and encroachment into the open countryside surrounding Addingham. It is also my view that Main Street provides a robust boundary for the Green Belt in this part of the village.

6.107 The Inspector concluded at the time of the last Inquiry that by virtue of its prominent position at the south-eastern entrance to the village the site formed an integral part of the attractive setting which is seen on the approach from Ilkley. He also felt it was part of the broad tranche of attractive countryside running down from Addingham Moorside to surround the eastern end of the village, and that this open area provided a visually contrasting but aesthetically complementary setting for the buildings within the adjacent conservation area. In my view these observations and conclusions are equally valid now.

6.108 I have already concluded in relation to SOM/K/H1/110 and 111 that in terms of location of new residential development Addingham lies at the bottom of the hierarchy of provision as established in Policy H2 of RPG12. It should cater only for local needs and to support local services. I have seen no evidence to suggest that there is demonstrated need for more housing to provide for local needs over and above those which could be served by the allocated land on the former school site at Chapel Street. In light of this, and my view of the strong contribution made by the site to both Green Belt purposes and the setting and character of the village, I do not consider there are any exceptional circumstances for removing the site from the Green Belt in order to allocate it for residential purposes.

### **Recommendation**

6.109 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/113 & SOM/K/GB1/113: Land at Hollins Lane, Utley, Keighley (adjoining K/H2.21)**

#### **Objectors**

4221/5616 & 5617      *Messers TSS and GL Black*  
4224/5619 & 5620      *Exors of A R Illingworth Decd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The housing allocation K/H2.21 should be extended to include field No. 8749 to the south-west and also that part of field No. 9259 which is not presently included.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.110 Although site K/H2.21 was reallocated as safeguarded land within the RDDP (K/UR5.24), the objectors have maintained their objections, still wishing to see the present objection land allocated for housing within the plan. I have considered objections to the safeguarded land allocation in relation to K/UR5.24.

6.111 Within the FDDP the Green Belt boundary was amended from that shown in the adopted UDP. Now the whole of the curtilage of Whinburn is excluded from it and the boundary also mainly follows the line of dry stone walls bounding fields 9259 and 8749 rather than the more arbitrary line following no specific features within the adopted UDP. Although the present boundary crosses field No. 8749 and follows no well-defined physical feature I consider that, overall, the redrawn boundary is far more robust, logical and defensible than that within the adopted UDP. The objectors wish to see what was site K/H2.21 (now K/UR5.24) extended, originally by the addition of 0.9 hectares, and latterly by the

addition of a further 0.62 hectares. Most of this suggested extension would be within the Green Belt, with only the south-western portion of field No. 9259 excluded. I have concluded and recommended that site K/UR5.24 should remain as safeguarded land.

6.112 The land the objectors wish to see as a housing allocation comprises pasture fields that occupy a part of the flatter slopes of the more expansive open land stretching away to the south-west. It is more elevated than the safeguarded land site. I consider any residential development on it would be especially conspicuous in views from across and within the Aire valley and from along Shann Lane. This would be particularly the case as any buffer landscaping would take many years to provide any meaningful screening or assimilation. In my view the Green Belt land is correctly designated and in particular fulfils the Green Belt purposes of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and preventing urban sprawl. I do not consider there to be any exceptional circumstances for the release of any further Green Belt land within this area. It is therefore my overall conclusion that no modification to the RDDP is justified.

### **Recommendation**

6.113 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/114 & SOM/K/GB1/114: Land at Summerhill Lane, Steeton with Eastburn**

#### **Objector**

2973/5624 & 5625 *Mr David J A Thompson*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be released from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.
- It is in a sustainable location close to Steeton station and would be well related to the existing form of the settlement.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.114 The objection land extends to nearly 7.8 hectares and comprises a series of open fields to the eastern edge of Steeton. All but an extreme north-western small field are within the Green Belt as shown in the RDDP, as they are within the adopted UDP. The objection land incorporates 2 other pieces of land which are subject to similar objections (SOM/K/GB1/114.01 and SOM/K/GB1/114.02).

6.115 The site helps to prevent the sprawl of the settlement in an easterly direction in what is a fairly prominent location visible from the adjacent rail line, Keighley Road and beyond. I accept that existing housing and commercial development could, in part, act as a backdrop to some further development, particularly on the north-western portion of the overall site. However, I do not consider that this diminishes the site's role of providing part of the countryside setting for Steeton. Development here would intrude into this. To a lesser degree the land's Green Belt notation also helps to maintain the separation between the edges of Steeton and the north-western parts of Keighley, which are only just over 1 kilometre apart.

- 6.116 The restraint of development on peripheral greenfield sites such as this can also be beneficial in guiding and stimulating development on derelict and vacant brownfield sites within the urban areas, thereby helping regeneration there. I consider that the boundaries of the Green Belt as currently drawn are clear and robust. It is therefore my opinion that the objection land that is within the Green Belt is correctly identified as such. The extreme north-western field lies outside the Green Belt and has no notation on the Proposals Map. It is below the size threshold used within the RDDP for it to be a specific housing allocation.
- 6.117 For the Green Belt notation to be removed, as made clear by PPG2, there would have to be exceptional circumstances. I have considered the questions of the overall supply of land for housing and the general locational principles to be applied to its allocation in the Policy Framework volume of this report. In terms of Policy H2 of RPG12 this site would come towards the bottom of the hierarchy in the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land, where the emphasis is on development in urban areas and then market towns. Although the site is close to Steeton station, in terms of other sustainability characteristics, such as proximity to schools, shops, services and frequent bus routes, and the fact that the site is a greenfield one, the site is only moderately placed. I do not consider that these considerations override the broader locational criteria that should underpin the plan.
- 6.118 Neither these nor other considerations, such as development resulting in the existing cricket and football pitches forming a green space in what would be a more rounded and balanced settlement form, amount to such exceptional circumstances as to warrant the deletion of the Green Belt notation. Accordingly, I conclude that no modification to the RDDP is required.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.119 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/114.01 & SOM/K/GB1/114.01: Land to East of "Prenton", Summerhill Lane, Steeton with Eastburn**

#### **Objector**

*4210/5622 & 5623 Mr D Buckley*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site does not perform any Green Belt function and should be allocated for housing.
- It is a highly sustainable location.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.120 The arguments advanced in support of this objection are broadly similar to those discussed in relation to the larger objection site discussed under SOM/K/H1/114 above and reference should be made to that. It is additionally argued, however, that removing the untidy appearance of the land would assist in urban regeneration and allow a firm and relevant boundary to the village to be formed.

6.121 The objection land is a single paddock to the side of an existing residential curtilage. I have already stated in respect of the above-mentioned objection that the present Green Belt boundary is clear and robust. As PPG2 notes, the quality of the landscape is not relevant to the inclusion of land within the Green Belt or to its continued protection. The most important attribute of the Green Belt is its openness. This being the case, I do not agree that this particular argument is soundly based or provides an exceptional circumstance as to why the Green Belt boundary should be altered. I do not consider any modification to the RDDP is therefore justified.

### **Recommendation**

6.122 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/114.02 & SOM/K/GB1/114.02: Land at Summerhill Lane, Steeton with Eastburn**

#### **Objector**

*2131/10549 & 10550 Mrs Elizabeth Benson*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land is prime building land with easy access to Steeton station.
- If housing is built it could lead to the removal of an eyesore.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.123 The objection land is the same as that dealt with in relation to SOM/K/H1/114 above, apart from the absence of a small field at the north-western corner. Reference should be made to my response to that objection and to SOM/K/H1/114.01 as these are relevant to this particular objection.

### **Recommendation**

6.124 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/115: Land at Hollins Bank Lane, Steeton with Eastburn (SOM/K/GB1/115)**

#### **Objector**

*4180/5626 Mr R A Wright*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- Green Belt designation is not appropriate as the land is suitable for residential use and does not extend beyond the current built-up area, being surrounded on 3 sides by residential properties.
- All mains services, schools, rail station and hospital are close by.
- The site has been tidy for 14 years and is of no agricultural use.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.125 I have considered this objection in relation to SOM/K/GB1/115 below, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

6.126 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/H1/116 & SOM/K/GB1/116: Land at Skipton Road, Ilkley**

### **Objector**

1752/5628 & 5629 *Mr Chris Battersby*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land is completely different in appearance and function to the adjoining agricultural land. It should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.127 This roughly triangular site with a frontage to the Skipton Road (the A65) was part of the former Addingham to Ilkley rail line and has been subject to filling, tipping and re-shaping so that it now comprises vacant land on a number of different levels. I do not consider that I have enough information before me to reach a categoric view as to whether the site could be considered to be previously-developed as defined by Annex C of PPG3. However the Green Belt designation of the land within the adopted UDP has been carried forward to the RDDP. I accept that the land is somewhat different in character to the predominantly agricultural land to the northern side of Skipton Road from which it is separated by a belt of mature trees and slope. Nevertheless, its principal characteristic is its openness, providing a contrast to the residential development backing onto the southern side of the A65.

6.128 Despite the presence of a complex of 4 dwellings towards the western end of the site, I consider the land fulfils the Green Belt purposes of helping prevent the sprawl of Ilkley into the broader expanse of Green Belt to the town's northern side. It also prevents the erosion of the separation between Ilkley and Addingham. The existing Green Belt boundary follows the northern edge of Skipton Road and this is in my view clear and robust.

6.129 There have to be exceptional circumstances for removing land from the Green Belt. I have already concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is a sufficiency in the phase 1 housing supply without the need to allocate land that would represent an extension to an urban area. Although there is a bus stop on the site frontage the Council indicates that the level of service is such that it does not provide the 10-minute frequency which it defines as being good. The site is about 2km from Ilkley station and is not within ready walking distance of the range of shops, services, facilities and employment that the town has to offer. In sustainability terms I do not consider the site to be well placed.



6.130 I have also concluded that there is a shortfall in the plan's phase 2 housing provision and the Council will need to find additional housing land to help make up this shortfall. Nevertheless, the site's sustainability characteristics are such that I do not consider this amounts to an exceptional circumstance why the Green Belt should be changed to allow the objection land to be allocated for housing. I therefore do not consider the RDDP should be modified.

### **Recommendation**

6.131 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/118 & SOM/K/GB1/118: Providence Farm, Providence Lane, Oakworth**

#### **Objector**

4/5630 & 5787      *Ms D P Holmes*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The Green Belt boundary should be amended to exclude former agricultural buildings. There is no longer a working farm and the land would be suitable for limited housing development which would not erode the Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.132 The site is on the southern edge of Oakworth and within the RDDP the Green Belt boundary is shown running along an access drive to Providence Farm. The Green Belt includes within it a range of poor quality agricultural buildings now used as stabling, and part of an associated enclosed open storage area. At its north-eastern end the existing boundary follows only the line of a concrete hardstanding with further open land excluded from the Green Belt to the north-east. Modern housing development along Pasture Avenue flanks the land to its north-west. The suggested boundary alteration would exclude the farm buildings from the Green Belt and would follow a line marked by a post and rail fence along a small embankment to the open storage area associated with the buildings.

6.133 The Council has reviewed in detail the Green Belt boundary and has made slight alterations to it at Providence Farm compared with the adopted UDP. These factors, and the general circumstances surrounding the RDDP Green Belt, amount to special circumstances justifying a further revision making the boundary here more logical. The gap between Oakworth and Haworth along Providence Lane is relatively narrow and is already distinguished by sporadic development. The definition of the Green Belt here is therefore important in maintaining the separation and identity of these 2 settlements and for protecting the intervening countryside from encroachment. I do not consider that the boundary as drawn is particularly logical, and it does not follow a strongly defined feature at one point.

6.134 Modification of the boundary in line with the objector's suggestion might result in potential replacement of the admittedly poor quality farm buildings but with residential development that would serve to further erode this gap. In my view a more logical boundary definition at this point would be to run along the access drive to Providence

Farm and then along the rear curtilages of the houses to the south-east of Pasture Avenue, which provide a clearly defined edge by reason of their blockwork and boarding fencing.

### **Recommendation**

**6.135 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting the Green Belt boundary at Providence Farm shown on the Proposals Map and substituting a boundary running along the north-western edge of the access drive to Providence Farm and along the south-eastern curtilage boundaries of dwellings flanking the south-eastern side of Pasture Avenue, Oakworth.**

### **SOM/K/H1/119 & SOM/K/GB1/119: Land at 332 Halifax Road, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

*1421/5631 & 11076 Mr Simon Phillip Lynch*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be removed from the Green Belt as the land is to the side of a dwelling on which a replacement dwelling could be built.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.136 This triangular site comprising driveway and garden is bounded to its east by Halifax Road, to its west by an access road to Lees Moor Farm and to the south by the objector's end terrace house. It is wholly within the Green Belt.

6.137 PPG2 requires exceptional circumstances to exist to justify the revision of Green Belt boundaries. The fact that the site is part of a residential curtilage and that it could accommodate a dwelling does not in my view constitute such an exceptional circumstance for excluding the land from the Green Belt. It does not lie adjacent to the Green Belt boundary and any change to the boundary at this point would necessitate a more substantial release of land. This would run counter to the functions and purposes currently performed by the Green Belt in this area to the south of Keighley.

### **Recommendation**

**6.138 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/120 and SOM/K/GB1/120: Land at Black Moor Road, Haworth**

#### **Objector**

*717/5632 & 5633 Mr Steven Richard Thorpe*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be released from the Green Belt to allow the building of a single bungalow.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.139 The site comprises a small corner of a larger grassed field on which there is a lock-up garage and the remains of concrete bases of other garages standing adjacent to Black Moor Road. Amongst the functions performed by the Green Belt in this location are the prevention of sprawl, the maintenance of separation between Haworth, Oxenhope and Cullingworth and the safeguarding of the surrounding countryside from encroachment. PPG2 advises that existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless exceptional circumstances exist that make this necessary.

6.140 The site is set within the Green Belt and not on its edge. As a consequence, if it were to be released from the Green Belt it would be necessary to release a much larger area of land also. Although previously-developed in part, with an existing garage of no visual merit, the site is set within open countryside and its elevated position would make any replacement dwelling prominent and isolated. The Green Belt functions that I have identified would be undermined by the removal of the site from within it and any subsequent residential development. I do not consider there are any exceptional circumstances that justify the removal of the site from the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

6.141 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/216, SOM/K/TM17/216 & SOM/K/OS2/216: Rear of former IWS site, Rombalds View, Ilkley**

### **Objector**

2765/10086-88      *Mrs A Thompson*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land is misleadingly unallocated in the plan as it is being developed as a housing site.
- Concern about potential traffic congestion and impact on school places.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.142 Planning permission was granted on appeal in March 2001 for residential development of 78 dwellings and development is now well advanced. This permission post-dates the 1 April 2000 base date of the plan. Development can continue subject to conditions attached to the planning permission irrespective of whether the site was to be allocated for a particular use. As such, the concerns of the objector regarding traffic and school places are not material to my conclusions on the RDDP.

### **Recommendation**

6.143 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/H1/218 & SOM/K/GB1/218: Land at Bradford Road, Sandbeds, Keighley**

### **Objector**

*4188/10136 & 10137 Mr R H Smith*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site fulfils no Green Belt purposes, relates better to adjoining and nearby residential uses and should be allocated for residential use.
- Planning permission has previously been granted for part of the objection site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.144 This roughly rectangular site of about 2 hectares has a frontage of some 280 metres to Bradford Road. There is residential development to the east and west but there is no defined southern boundary, the land falling away to the River Aire. The land is designated Green Belt, this having been carried forward from the adopted UDP. I agree with the Council that the site performs the important Green Belt purposes of providing separation between the built-up areas of Keighley and Crossflatts and preventing further residential sprawl along Bradford Road. From the Council's evidence there are no extant planning permissions affecting the site.

6.145 PPG2 advises that Green Belt boundaries should be changed only where exceptional circumstances make this necessary. I consider that the existing Green Belt boundary is robust. The site comes well down the hierarchy of the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land set out in Policy H2 of RPG12. Despite my conclusions that there is a shortfall in both phase 2 supply and safeguarded land, the strong Green Belt purposes performed by the site lead me to the view that it should not be a strong contender to make good any shortfall.

6.146 I therefore conclude that the exceptional circumstances needed to warrant excluding the land from the Green Belt are lacking and no modification to the RDDP is justified.

### **Recommendation**

6.147 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/H1/220 & SOM/K/GB1/220: Land at Greenhead Farm, Halifax Road/Haworth Road, Keighley**

### **Objector**

*2501/10083 & 10084 Turner Hartley and Holmes*

### **Summary of Objections**

- This Green Belt allocation should be revised and the land reallocated as a phase 1 housing site.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.148 The objection land is an extensive site of mostly agricultural land extending from the edge of the settlement of Cross Roads in a southerly direction. The majority of the site is designated Green Belt, this being carried forward from the adopted UDP. I agree with the Council that the Green Belt designation of this large swathe of land fulfils the purpose of contributing to the separation between Cross Roads and settlements to the south. It also prevents Cross Roads encroaching further into the open countryside, whilst at the same time helping to maintain the open and rural character of the area. By constraining development on what would be a peripheral, mostly greenfield site the Green Belt designation may also help to stimulate development on derelict and vacant sites within the urban area. The site therefore fulfils 4 of the 5 purposes of Green Belt designation.
- 6.149 Although the objectors have indicated a wish for the land wholly or in part to be reallocated for housing development they have provided no supporting evidence for this. I have considered the general provision of housing and its location in the Policy Framework volume of this report and have concluded that there is a sufficiency of phase 1 housing allocations made up from sites within the urban areas.
- 6.150 This site is not within a defined urban area where development should be concentrated in accordance with policy. It would be a substantial greenfield addition to a less well located settlement within the district where there are limited local services and facilities. In terms of the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land within development plans, as set out in Policy H2 of RPG12, this site would come towards the bottom of the hierarchy. There is no evidence to suggest that additional housing is necessary to satisfy any particular local need.
- 6.151 I therefore consider there to be no justification for the allocation of this land for residential development and no exceptional circumstances for making any alteration to the present Green Belt boundary. Accordingly, I am of the view that no modification to the RDDP is justified.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.152 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/221, SOM/K/GB1/221 & SOM/K/GB1/221.01 : Land at St Ians Croft, Addingham**

## **Objectors**

4199/10144 & 10145 *Clays Construction*  
3109/10091 *Mr Michael William Rickaby*

## **Summary of Objections**

- The site is within an area that does not perform any Green Belt function and its release for development would ensure a logical and defensible Green Belt boundary.
- The site is in a sustainable location and is suitable for housing or, failing this, safeguarded land.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.153 The objection land comprises the 3 elements of actively used allotments, pasture and the residential curtilages of Southfield Barn and Low Laithe. In respect of the latter, changes to Southfield Barn have taken place since the Council's Green Belt review. The Council considers that these have served to diminish the value of the small area of Green Belt within these domestic curtilages. A strong boundary exists along their southern edge. I concur with the Council that the changes are such that the land within these curtilages now serves little Green Belt purpose. The changes amount to exceptional circumstances why this element of the objection land should be deleted from the Green Belt.
- 6.154 However, I do not agree with the objector, Clays Construction, that the balance of the objection land serves no Green Belt purpose. I consider that the role played by this part of the Green Belt may not be as significant as that immediately to the west. Nevertheless, despite a large part of the site being fairly narrow and sandwiched between the A65 and existing residential development, I consider it serves the purpose of preventing the further sprawl of the village into what would be a conspicuous location alongside this main road. It would also prevent encroachment into what is part of the countryside setting of the village.
- 6.155 So far as the site's allocation for housing is concerned, my conclusions and recommendations regarding the RDDP's overall amounts and location of housing provision are contained in the Policy Framework volume of this report. Whilst I have identified a sufficiency in provision within phase 1 there is a shortfall within phase 2 and in the amount of safeguarded land needed to ensure that the Green Belt boundary endures well beyond the plan period. However, in terms of RPG Policy H2 Addingham comes at the bottom of the hierarchy in this policy's sequential approach to the allocation of housing land. It is a rural settlement where the provision of housing should be to meet local needs and/or support local services.
- 6.156 I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that the allocation of the land for housing is required to meet local housing needs or bolster ailing facilities. If my other recommendations are accepted then there will in any case be a housing allocation within the village that will provide for future housing needs on land which is previously-developed. Whilst I am recommending that another site, land at Wharfe Park, should not be allocated, this is not in the Green Belt, is well related to the village form, and could cater for local housing needs should there be a proven future requirement. In my view it would not be appropriate in terms of the broader locational principles of Policy H2 for the present site to make a contribution to what the objector perceives as a shortfall in housing provision within the Wharfedale area generally. Overall, I do not consider the site's allocation for housing would accord well with advice in PPG3.
- 6.157 In the Policy Framework volume of this report I recommend that the Council carries out a full scale review of the Green Belt to encompass sufficient safeguarded land to provide for longer term development needs. If this recommendation is accepted I consider it would be inappropriate to indicate in advance of such a comprehensive review whether the land should be safeguarded. Therefore, it is my view that there are no exceptional circumstances warranting the deletion of the bulk of the objection site from the Green Belt. The only modification necessary to the RDDP is the deletion of the Green Belt designation as it applies to Low Laithe and Southfield Barn.

## **Recommendation**

**6.158 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the removal of the curtilages of Low Laithe and Southfield Barn from the Green Belt.**

**SOM/K/H1/223 & SOM/K/GB1/223: Land at Street House Farm, The Street, Addingham**

### **Objector**

*4199/10142 & 10143 Clays Construction*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land does not fulfil Green Belt purposes. It is no longer reasonable to include it within the Green Belt and the land should be allocated for housing to provide support for existing services and facilities in Addingham.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.159 The objection land comprises a number of dwellings and their domestic curtilages, together with a paddock, a strip of unkempt land and a small coppice, all of which is designated as Green Belt within the RDDP. The Council acknowledges that its Green Belt review was not properly followed in respect of this land. It accepts that, apart from a narrow tongue of the objection land that projects northwards into the valley of the Marchup Beck, beyond the curtilage of The Arches, this land does not fulfil any of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. I concur with this assessment and consider that the failure to fulfil these purposes amounts to an exceptional circumstance that would allow the land's removal from the Green Belt.

6.160 The objector considers that the paddock, unkempt strip and curtilage of Street House Farm should be allocated for housing. The broad arguments relating to housing provision in Addingham are the same as those discussed in relation to SOM/K/H1/221 above, with the objector, Clays Construction, raising similar objections.

6.161 Part of the objection land, being a domestic curtilage, does fall within the definition of previously-developed land. Nevertheless, I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that the allocation of the land for housing is required to meet local housing needs. In sustainability terms I consider the site is far less well located, in relation to the limited range of shops, services and facilities and bus routes within the village, than that site which the Council has allocated for housing (K/H2.9).

6.162 Whilst I am recommending that another site, land at Wharfe Park, should not be allocated, that site is better related to the village form and facilities, and could cater for local housing needs should there be a proven future requirement. There is nothing therefore to elevate the present objection land above those which, in locational and sustainability terms, are better placed. Furthermore, the land is accessed off a private drive serving 5 dwellings. To cater for additional dwellings a larger road would be required and the Council indicates that there is insufficient width available and no realistic alternatives to provide this. This strengthens my conclusion that none of the objection land should be allocated for residential purposes.

## **Recommendation**

**6.163 I recommend that the RDDP should be modified by the removal from the Green Belt of that area of land shown on the plan at Appendix B, dated 24 July 2003, accompanying the Council's response to the objection.**

### **SOM/K/H1/224 & SOM/K/GB1/224: Land at Barrows Lane, Steeton with Eastburn**

#### **Objector**

*4179/10134 & 10135 Brighthouse Estate Co Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.164 The site is included within the Green Belt in the adopted UDP and objections to this allocation were heard at the previous UDP Inquiry. I understand that planning permission for a dwelling on part of the site was granted in 1992 but has not been legally implemented and has now expired. My colleague Inspector concluded that the site formed part and parcel of the Green Belt extending to the south and east. I have no reason to disagree with his assessment.

6.165 The boundary of the site of Woodlands Mill forms a strong end to the built area on the east side of Barrows Lane, and the objection site forms an integral part of the generally open land to the south and east. Since the earlier planning permission was granted national, regional and local policy has changed significantly, and development of the site would be contrary to current guidance. The residential development west of Barrows Lane does not constitute the exceptional circumstances necessary to remove land from the Green Belt. Indeed, that development is an unfortunate example of urban sprawl and encroachment into the countryside, that Green Belt policy seeks to prevent.

6.166 I conclude, therefore, that the removal of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for housing is not justified. Such development would constitute urban sprawl and unnecessary encroachment into the countryside. In addition, there are significant areas of land in the vicinity allocated in the RDDP for housing and as safeguarded land that would satisfy any potential need for residential development in the area.

## **Recommendation**

**6.167 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/225 & SOM/K/GB1/225: Land at Morton Lane, East Morton**

#### **Objectors**

*4141/10115 & 10116 Mr and Dr Jepson*



## Summary of Objections

- The site should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.168 PPG2 indicates that Green Belt boundaries should not be changed except in exceptional circumstances. The Council has reviewed the Green Belt boundary and considered that in respect of this site there should be no change, the boundary being robust and well defined and the site performing several of the purposes of Green Belt designation. I concur with the Council's assessment that the Green Belt here helps to prevent the sprawl of East Morton village in a south-easterly direction. Additionally, the site, particularly in view of its tree cover, is very important in contributing to the separation of East Morton from Crossflatts and Micklethwaite. Development on the site would serve to encroach on the wedge of countryside between East Morton and Micklethwaite.
- 6.169 Although the objectors argue that as a former quarry the site should be considered to be previously-developed land I disagree. Annex C of PPG3 deals with the definition of such land. I have seen no evidence to suggest that when former quarrying ceased the land was restored through normal development control procedures. Nevertheless, I consider that the natural regeneration of the site has blended the quarry into the landscape to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings. In accordance with PPG3 this would preclude the site's definition as being previously-developed land.
- 6.170 In terms of the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land as set out in Policy H2 of RPG12 the site comes towards the bottom of the hierarchy. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that a sufficiency of supply of phase 1 residential land can be achieved from sites which come higher in the sequential approach.
- 6.171 I disagree with the objectors that the site is well-placed in relation to services, facilities and public transport. With regards the latter, a bus service past the site is infrequent and there is a steep walk of about 800 metres to more frequent services on Bradford Road. The nearest station is about 2 kilometres away. Overall, I do not consider the sustainability characteristics of the site are good. They certainly do not weigh highly in favour of the site's allocation despite my identification of a shortfall in phase 2 allocations and safeguarded land. Nor do I consider that other factors, such as possible improvements to road safety within Morton Lane that could result from the site's development, constitute exceptional circumstances that would warrant its removal from the Green Belt and allocation for residential purposes. I therefore conclude that no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

## Recommendation

- 6.172 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/232, SOM/K/GB1/232, SOM/K/H2/232 & SOM/K/UR5/232: Daisy Hill Farm, Black Hill Lane, Keighley**

## Objector

3842/10102-10105 *Taywood Homes Ltd*

## Summary of Objections

- The site should be allocated for housing or, failing that, safeguarded land rather than Green Belt.
- Development would be well related to existing development, would be sustainably located and capable of being satisfactorily accessed.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.173 Within the adopted UDP the objection land is designated as Green Belt and this is carried through to both the FDDP and RDDP. The site of just over 7 hectares comprises farmland with a complex of farm buildings at Daisy Hill Farm towards its centre. I consider the land is correctly designated as Green Belt since it fulfils the purposes of preventing further urban sprawl onto this prominent and elevated land along Black Hill Lane. It also stops encroachment into the open countryside, of which the land is a part, on this north-western side of Keighley. To a lesser extent it also assists in the Green Belt purpose of providing separation between settlements. In my view the Green Belt boundary, drawn to the rear of residential curtilages on the southern and eastern edges of the objection land, is clear and robust.
- 6.174 I have concluded within the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is an adequacy of housing land supply within phase 1 of the plan, but a deficiency in phase 2 housing provision within the District. It is therefore appropriate to consider objection sites in this light, whilst judging them against the current policy background, which of course is different to when the existing UDP was going through its Inquiry.
- 6.175 In terms of RPG Policy H2 sequential development would represent an extension to Keighley. This is greenfield rather than previously-developed land and I do not agree that the site is a particularly sustainable one having regard to accessibility to services and jobs by good public transport. Although both primary and secondary schools are within the Council's thresholds of reasonable walking distance, there are only very limited other facilities and sources of employment close by. Bus services along Black Hill Lane and Braithwaite Road do not meet the Council's definition of a good service, with an hourly service along the former road which does not run at peak times. The land is about 2km from the centre of Keighley and its elevated location would involve steep climbs that would be likely to deter most walking and cycling.
- 6.176 I have not been informed of any constraints regarding existing or potential infrastructure to serve the site. However, whilst not mentioned by the Council, I noted on my site visits the presence of an active landfill site a short distance to the west of the objection land. Although I have seen no evidence of the nature of this operation its presence both in terms of environmental nuisance and possible contamination would need considering in respect of the possible residential development of this site.
- 6.177 I consider that despite the phase 2 shortfall identified the objection land does not accord well with RPG12 Policy H2 or PPG3. There are no exceptional circumstances for releasing the land from the Green Belt. Nor would it be correct to designate it as safeguarded land in advance of a review. It is therefore my overall view that no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

## **Recommendation**

6.178 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/234: Land adjacent to Airedale Hospital, Steeton with Eastburn  
(SOM/K/CF4/234)**

### **Objector**

3842/10111 *Taywood Homes Ltd*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land is not within the ownership or control of the Airedale NHS Trust, should not be classed as non-operational hospital land, and should be added to the site to the west, which should be allocated for housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.179 Within the RDDP this land was added to site K/UR5.4 rather than continuing to be protected as non-operational hospital land under Policy CF4. I have considered this in relation to K/UR5.4 above.

## **Recommendation**

6.180 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/237, SOM/K/OS1/237 & SOM/K/OS6/237: Land at Parkwood Rise, Keighley**

### **Objector**

4196/10127-10129 *Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site's allocation as allotments and urban greenspace should be deleted and the site allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.181 PPG17 advises that existing open space should not be built upon unless an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows the land to be surplus to requirements. The Council acknowledged at the Inquiry that there was no robust up-to-date analysis of open space needs. Nevertheless, a specific survey of the local community in relation to the allotment use of the land was conducted in 1999, the outcome of which was that the Council considered allotment use was not viable. The Council accepts that allotment use has been abandoned, there is no community support for them, and their use is unlikely to be re-instated. It therefore now proposes that the site's allocation as allotments be deleted. The land has no other active community use.

- 6.182 The Parkwood urban greenspace contains the site and is a large area of open land and mature woodland that helps to form an important landscape setting for Keighley. However, I consider that the objection land is, in visual terms, largely isolated and separated from the main element of the greenspace by the presence of the multi-storey blocks of flats to the north, and the rising hillside. These serve to contain the land as a somewhat discrete element sandwiched between the flats and dwellings to the south which front onto Park Lane. The land, in my view, makes a negligible contribution to the larger expanse of greenspace. In its present state it has no particular urban quality and does not serve any of the other principal functions of open space as set out in the Annex to PPG17. This being the case I consider that the land, as open space, is surplus.
- 6.183 The Council has not carried out any sustainability appraisal of the site but it accepts that it is generally well located in terms of facilities and public transport, being relatively close to the centre of Keighley and bus services within Park Lane. Nor has the Council provided evidence that there are any insuperable difficulties in the site being residentially developed. I therefore concur with the objectors that the site should be allocated for residential purposes. Given my conclusions regarding housing land supply and general locational principles in the Policy Framework volume of this report, and also the present highway constraints that exist at Coney Lane Bridge, discussed in relation to K/UR5.22, I consider that the site should be a phase 2 allocation. This would also relate well to the phasing of the nearby allocated housing site at Parkwood Rise (K/H2.39), in respect of which there have been no duly made objections.
- 6.184 Accordingly, I am of the view that both the allotment and urban greenspace designations should be deleted and the land allocated as a phase 2 housing site.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.185 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of both the allotment and urban greenspace allocations relating to this land and that these be substituted by a phase 2 housing allocation.**

### **SOM/K/H1/241, SOM/K/GB1/241 & SOM/K/OS7/241: Land at Lees Lane, Haworth**

#### **Objector**

*4146/10118, 10119 Skipton Properties Ltd  
& 10130*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- Part of the land should be deleted from the village greenspace and the Green Belt and allocated as a phase 1 housing site.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.186 Within both the FDDP and the RDDP the objection land is allocated as village greenspace, its previous partial designation as Green Belt within the adopted UDP having been deleted as part of the Council's Green Belt review. The land lies alongside K/H1.36 where an extant residential planning permission has been implemented. Most of the land is currently in use as a construction compound connected with this and there is also

tipped material so that its true nature was largely obscured at the time of my site visits. Nevertheless, the site forms part of the much larger swathe of village greenspace stretching up both sides of the valley between Haworth and Lees/Cross Roads. I consider that once construction works have finished and the land has been restored it will be an important element in this overall open area, helping to frame the development on K/H1.36 and preventing development encroaching further down the valley towards the listed building complex of Ebor Mills.

6.187 No further justification has been provided for the suggestion that the land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site. In locational terms Haworth is not part of the urban area, where development should be concentrated. I have concluded that there is a sufficiency in the supply of phase 1 housing land made up from sites which are in policy, locational and sustainability terms more appropriate. Having regard to this site I do not consider that there is therefore any reason to modify the RDDP.

### **Recommendation**

6.188 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/255: Bolling Road Primary School, Ben Rhydding, Ilkley (SOM/K/CF1/3)**

#### **Objector**

983/10055 *Mr William Boocock*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- Limitations of proposals currently affecting the school offer no improvements to an old, expensive school.
- Housing development adjacent to playing fields should be avoided, so a new school should be built on part of the adjacent playing field.
- Housing on the school site would offer the opportunity for affordable housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.189 The site comprises school buildings and associated play areas and car park surrounded by residential development to all sides. The school (now re-named Ben Rhydding Primary School) is in active primary education use and as part of a recently completed education reorganisation programme there are no plans for its closure or replacement. Re-allocation for housing purposes of this actively used site would not therefore be appropriate in these circumstances.

6.190 The playing fields to which it is assumed the objector is referring lie to the west and provide facilities for the school. These are protected from development by their allocation under Policy OS3 within the RDDP.

### **Recommendation**

6.191 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/272 & SOM/K/GB1/272: Land at Five Oaks House, Ben Rhydding Drive, Ilkley**

**Objector**

4683/7437 & 7438     *Mr Ulrich Rietschel*

**Summary of Objections**

- The site should be released from the Green Belt for low density housing use. It does not serve a Green Belt purpose, has historically been used as part of the residential Five Oaks site, and is affected by adjacent commercial/residential uses.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.192 This site comprises part of the large grounds of Five Oaks, a substantial 1930s house, which now not only contain various dwellings and flats but also a riding stables. It lies on the north-eastern side of Ben Rhydding Drive, which is flanked by open countryside and low density residential development in an area designated as Green Belt between Ilkley and Burley-in-Wharfedale.

6.193 In my view the site is an integral part of the Green Belt, serving several of its purposes. There are mature trees around the north-eastern and north-western site boundaries to provide some screening. However, further residential development would be likely to be visible not only from Ben Rhydding Drive but also from vantage points on the northern side of the Wharfe valley. It would consolidate existing sporadic development, increasing sprawl and helping to reduce the visual separation between Ilkley and Burley. This general area contributes to the countryside setting of Ilkley as an attractive historic town. PPG2 advises that Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless there are exceptional circumstances. I do not consider there are any such circumstances in this case that would justify exclusion of this parcel of land from the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

6.194 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/275, SOM/K/H1/276, SOM/K/OS2/213 & SOM/K/GB1/222: Land at Southfield Farm, Addingham**

**Objector**

4199/7515, 7517,     *Clays Construction*  
7519 & 10839

**Summary of Objections**

- The land does not perform any Green Belt function and this designation should therefore be deleted.
- The landscape value of the land can be maintained through a suitable development scheme.

- Circumstances are different to those at the time of the last UDP Inquiry, particularly in terms of providing for the long-term development needs of the district and securing the permanence of the Green Belt. This site could provide an element of housing supply either within or after the current plan period.
- The RDDP's provisions for safeguarded land are inadequate.
- The site is in a sustainable location and it provides one of the few opportunities in Wharfedale for accommodating new development with little harm to the environment.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.195 The vast majority of the site comprises a series of pasture fields contained between the Addingham bypass (the A65) to the south, housing development of different eras to the east and west, and development mostly with frontage to Main Street to the north. Within the RDDP the northern portion of the objection land is allocated as village greenspace (Policy OS7), whilst the remainder is designated as Green Belt. These are carried forward from the adopted UDP, (apart from a minor adjustment to the Green Belt boundary at its north-western edge). Whilst the original objection suggested that part of the site should be allocated for residential development it was clarified at the Inquiry that what was now sought was a safeguarded land allocation.

#### *Green Belt*

6.196 I agree with the Council that the designation of the open pastureland with its mature boundary trees sweeping down from the bypass towards the centre of the village serves 3 of the 5 purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Firstly, it would prevent sprawl of the village into the surrounding countryside. Here I share the views of the Inspector who considered similar objections to the now adopted UDP. He concluded that the existing modern residential development to the south and south-west of the village, which partially encloses the objection land, has sprawled across the northern flank of Rombalds Moor. In this regard I have noted and considered the substantial evidence provided on the assessment of visual impact. In my own assessment from walking and driving around the area I too consider that this existing development is intrusive when viewed from vantage points overlooking the village. Additional residential development would, to my mind, only serve to consolidate and compound this.

6.197 Like the previous Inspector I also consider the Green Belt designation of this area would serve to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. I do not consider that the countryside starts only to the south of the bypass. In my view the objection land, in terms of its scale and character, is an integral part of the wider countryside framework extending right into the heart of the village. Even if residential development were to take place along the lines suggested by the objectors, so that a central open area of land continued to extend almost up to Main Street, there would still be a marked reduction in the present broader swathe of attractive pastureland. From my several visits to the area and observations from various suggested vantage points, both close at hand and further afield, I am not in any doubt that the present extent of open countryside performs a very important part in maintaining the village's character and setting.

6.198 I do not consider this function to be seriously impaired by the presence of the bypass. In passing the village at this point it is partially in a slight cutting and screened by hedging and trees. These help to ensure the visual continuity of the farmland to its north and south sides so that it, rather than the road, is the dominant visual element. However, I believe that the effective narrowing of this tranche of countryside through the addition of

residential development on its east and west flanks, as suggested in the objector's concept plan, would seriously diminish the countryside setting and represent a marked encroachment into it. It is my view that this would be the case irrespective of whatever buffer or boundary planting might take place, or additional footpath provision be made, within the retained central area. The impact would apply whether viewing the land from more distant points around the village or experiencing the land at first hand by walking across the footpaths on it, including an ancient section of a hollowed lane.

- 6.199 The present designation would also, to a limited extent, fulfil in a generalised way a third Green Belt purpose of assisting urban regeneration by encouraging development on brownfield sites within the urban areas through the restriction of that on greenfield sites. I accept, however, that if the site was to be allocated as safeguarded land this should not affect the release or development of brownfield urban sites during the plan period.
- 6.200 I consider that the Green Belt boundary as presently defined is sufficiently clear and robust. However, were it not for the importance I attach to the functions of the swathe of open land within the centre of the village discussed above, I do accept the objector's argument that the line of the bypass itself would be a strong and logical long-term boundary. Nevertheless, there would have to be exceptional circumstances to persuade me that this line should be adopted and the area of land to the north removed from the Green Belt.

#### *Need for housing*

- 6.201 The objector's principal argument for this is that there is a limited supply of available housing within Wharfedale, which they see as a distinct market area. Attendant problems with the limited supply are a lack of opportunity for new households, the encouragement of longer-distance out-migration to Harrogate and Craven districts, and significant house price inflation. These are coupled with a perceived insufficiency of safeguarded land allocated within the plan to ensure that the Green Belt will endure beyond the plan period.
- 6.202 My conclusions about housing land supply, a market area approach to allocations, and the level of safeguarded land necessary to ensure that the Green Belt boundary endures well beyond the plan period, are set out in the Policy Framework volume of this report. I have concluded that there is in fact an insufficiency of both phase 2 housing and safeguarded land. In respect of the latter the Council should carry out a full-scale review of the Green Belt to encompass sufficient safeguarded land to provide for long-term development needs. However, safeguarding land implies that at some stage development is likely to take place. Because of the importance I attach to the landscape contribution of this area, and the Green Belt purposes fulfilled by that part of it so designated, it is my view that a designation as safeguarded land would be inappropriate.
- 6.203 The policy background, particularly in respect of the focus on providing sustainable development, has changed since the previous UDP Inquiry. In terms of access by sustainable means of transport several bus services pass through the village, but by the plan's definition the frequency of services is not good. The objection land is over 5 kilometres from the nearest railway station at Ilkley, or the more distant alternative at Silsden/Steeton. Within the Local Transport Plan there are no proposals for specific improvements to public transport extending into Addingham. The village is therefore a less well located settlement within the terms of the plan.



- 6.204 Having regard to the sequential approach to the identification of housing land within RPG Policy H2 Addingham, being within a rural area, comes at the bottom in the hierarchy. Here development should be to meet local needs and/or support local services, giving priority to the re-use of previously-developed land and to conserving character. There is no specific claim that housing on the site is necessary to meet local needs and/or support local services other than the general point that it could provide support for existing services and facilities by increasing population numbers. If my other recommendations are accepted then there will in any case be a housing allocation within the village that will provide for future housing needs on land which is previously-developed. Whilst I am recommending that another site, land at Wharfe Park, should not be allocated, this is not in the Green Belt, is well related to the village form, and could cater for local housing needs should there be a proven future requirement.
- 6.205 I have seen no evidence to suggest that there are any fundamental physical and environmental constraints to development of the present objection land, or that the capacity of existing or potential infrastructure could not cope with additional housing. Nevertheless, from a locational point of view I do not consider that allocating the site as safeguarded land or as a housing allocation would accord well with either RPG Policy H2 or advice in paragraph 31 of PPG3.

#### *Open Space*

- 6.206 The objector claims that development along the lines of that suggested in its concept plan could ensure that the public open space, important to the character and appearance of the village, could be provided and maintained by the site developer, an aim which is unlikely to be achieved without developer contributions. This could better fulfil the objectives of PPG17 in relation to the use of public open space. However, public access to village greenspace is not a prerequisite. There is no reason to suppose that the area of farmland forming the present greenspace would not remain in use as such and therefore continue to contribute as at present.

#### *Overall conclusion*

- 6.207 I have seen nothing to diminish the conclusions of the previous Inspector dealing with objections to the now adopted UDP, in respect of the significant role that this site plays in landscape terms in relation to the character, setting and appearance of Addingham. That part of the site within the Green Belt fulfils important purposes of this designation. Its removal from the Green Belt and allocation as safeguarded land, with the possible eventual development along the lines of the objector's concept plan, would seriously detract from its present role to the detriment of the village. The importance of the land in this regard in my view outweighs the need to amend the Green Belt boundary to allocate further safeguarded land in what is a less well located settlement within the district. Accordingly, I consider no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

#### **Recommendation**

- 6.208 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/H1/353: Ilkley Middle School Playing Fields, Wheatley Lane, Ilkley**

### **Objector**

2768/10374

*Mr Andrew D Walbank*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The school should be retained as a sixth form college whilst part of the existing playing field could be developed for housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.209 I have considered the question of the retention of the school in relation to K/H1.11 above. In response to objections relating to the allocation of the school premises for housing I have accepted the evidence from the Education Authority. This indicates that there is no requirement for the site to be safeguarded for educational use. I have therefore agreed that the school buildings and immediate surroundings should be allocated for housing, as proposed in the RDDP. This being the case, I see no justification for the retention of the school buildings and the transfer of the housing allocation to part of the playing field as suggested by the objector. No modification to the RDDP is therefore necessary.

### **Recommendation**

6.210 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/H1/353.01: Ilkley Middle School Playing Fields, Wheatley Lane, Ilkley**

### **Objector**

721/10756

*Mr Robert Alfred Tilley*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The housing proposal on Bolling Road (K/H1.10) should be deleted and substituted by an allocation on the northern part of Ilkley Middle School Playing Fields.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.211 The housing allocation K/H1.10 shown within the FDDP has been removed from the RDDP and the land is now allocated together with the rest of the adjoining open area as playing fields. In this regard the objector's concerns that that site is needed as open space for community use have already been satisfied.

6.212 I have concluded that there is an adequacy of supply of land for housing in phase 1. In this regard I do not consider there to be a need to allocate further land for housing on what are protected playing fields at Ilkley Middle School. This is particularly so as the school buildings and immediately adjoining land should themselves be allocated for housing under K/H1.11. On this basis I consider no modification to the RDDP to be necessary.

## **Recommendation**

**6.213 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/H1/355 & K/OS1.7:Land at Parkwood Rise, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

*3939/9894 & 10376 Keighley Rifle Club*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land is of no recreational value or significant benefit to the urban greenspace, is an eyesore, and should be allocated for housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.214 The objection land forms a section of the south-western end of the extensive Parkwood urban greenspace and part of it is a former quarry and brickworks. The objector has argued that the land could be considered to be previously-developed. However, it is my view that the degree of natural regeneration with trees and shrubs that has taken place, and the fact that a portion of it is occupied by allotments, clearly make the site a greenfield one, having regard to the PPG3 Annex C definition.
- 6.215 The objector has suggested that only the central portion of the site might be allocated for housing, leaving open areas to either side as buffers and with the area to be developed being served from the adjoining allocated housing site, K/H2.39, to which there have been no objections. This adjacent site has never been part of the urban greenspace. However, I consider that the objection land does form an integral part of the wider urban greenspace. Its open and regenerated quality has an important role in contributing to the separation of Parkwood and Long Lee and providing part of a large area of greenspace of amenity value close to the town centre and residential areas. In this regard I do not consider it to be an eyesore.
- 6.216 PPG17 makes it clear that open space should not be developed unless it is clearly shown to be surplus. Although the Council has not undertaken an appraisal along these lines it is my view that the site's contribution to the wider area of greenspace means that it does fulfil an important role and could not be described as surplus land. I consider that residential development on the site would harmfully intrude into the greenspace and diminish its overall separating and amenity function.
- 6.217 In locational terms the objection land is quite well placed, being close to a bus route, a primary school, and a limited number of neighbourhood shops. It is about 600m from Keighley town centre and railway station. Despite my view that there is a shortage of housing land within phase 2 of the plan period, and the sustainability characteristics of the site, I consider its contribution to the Parkwood urban greenspace is such that it should not be considered, even in part, for housing development. Consequently, I consider no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

## **Recommendation**

**6.218 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/378 & SOM/K/GB1/378: Land at Whinburn Farm, Hollins Lane, Utley, Keighley**

### **Objector**

*2973/10924 & 10925 Mr David J A Thompson*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.219 I agree with the Council that the land performs several of the purposes of Green Belts: designation prevents the sprawl of urban development onto the prominent valley slope to the south-western side of Hollins Lane and the harmful consolidation of the ribbon of development to the opposite side of the road; it safeguards what is an extensive tract of open countryside from encroachment; and it helps to maintain the open break between the north-western fringe of Keighley and Steeton. In my view the presently defined boundaries of the Green Belt in respect of this land are clear and robust.

6.220 For the Green Belt notation to be removed exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated. The objector argues that the land should be released for housing development, the site being close to 2 schools and a regular bus service giving good access to Keighley. He also considers there would be minimal intrusion because of natural screening by mature trees. In my view, whilst the land may be reasonably close to 2 secondary schools, it is not well placed in relation to junior schools, frequent bus services, shops and other facilities. In sustainability terms its location is not good. Despite the presence of trees I consider that residential development on this site of over 4 hectares would be an intrusive element, which, as already stated above, would represent an encroachment into the countryside.

6.221 I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that there is an adequacy of housing land supply in phase 1 without the need for large urban extensions. I have also concluded that there is a shortfall in the phase 2 provision and in the amount of safeguarded land necessary to cater for development beyond the plan period. In this latter regard I am further recommending that the Council undertakes a full-scale review of the Green Belt to encompass a sufficiency of safeguarded land.

6.222 The site would represent an extension to Keighley but I attach a great deal of importance to the purposes and functions of the Green Belt within this area. These, together with the relatively poor sustainability characteristics of the objection land, lead me to conclude that it would not be appropriate as a phase 2 allocation. Nor do I consider it appropriate to consider the site's allocation as safeguarded land in advance of any further review of the Green Belt the Council might undertake. It is therefore my overall conclusion that there are insufficient exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the land from the

Green Belt and its allocation for residential purposes within the plan. No modification to the RDDP is therefore warranted.

### **Recommendation**

**6.223 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H1/420: Park Lane, Parkwood, Keighley (K/UR5.22 & K/H2.17)**

### **Objector**

3839/12628 *Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The site should be allocated as a phase 1 or phase 2 housing site and not safeguarded.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.224 I have considered this objection in relation to K/UR5.22 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

**6.225 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.22 and its replacement as a phase 2 housing allocation.**

**SOM/K/H1/421: Moss Carr Road, Long Lee, Keighley (K/UR5.19 & K/H2.14)**

### **Objector**

3839/12627 *Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 or phase 2 housing site and not safeguarded land.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.226 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H2.14 below, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

**6.227 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **K/H2.1 & K/CF1.2: Parkway/Clough Avenue, Steeton with Eastburn, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

4146/7182 *Skipton Properties Ltd*  
4229/2967 *Mrs J Horsfall & Exors of S D P Clough decd*  
4146/12585 & 12586 *Skipton Properties Ltd*  
4229/12654 & 12655 *Mrs J Horsfall & Exors of S D P Clough decd*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be allocated as a phase 1 rather than a phase 2 housing site.
- There is no justification for the allocation of land for a primary school.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.228 This greenfield site of improved pasture was allocated for housing purposes in the adopted UDP. This followed the conclusions in the Inspector's report that it was well within the framework of the built-up area and was well suited to development. An allocation of a part of the site for a new primary school was made at the time of adoption of the existing UDP. A review of education needs in the district has now taken place and the Council accepts that it is no longer necessary to reserve part of the site for this purpose. I therefore recommend modification of the RDDP by the removal of this allocation.

6.229 The circumstances of my Inquiry are different from those obtaining at the time of the previous UDP Inquiry. The objection land lies within Steeton, which the RDDP classes as a smaller settlement in a good public transport corridor. The RDDP's phase 1 housing requirement is largely met by sites which are in more sustainable settlements than Steeton. Against this background there is no requirement to promote the objection land from phase 2 to 1, even on the basis that, as a relatively large site, the phasing could be split.

6.230 In relation to phase 2 requirements, I am satisfied from the evidence presented that the site occupies a reasonably sustainable location, being within about 250 metres of a main bus route providing 3 to 4 buses per hour to Keighley and an hourly service to Skipton and Colne. If the proposed cycle route subject to Policy K/TM20.6 is implemented this would link the site via the adjacent industrial estate to Steeton station, when much of the site would lie within about 800 metres. The site is within 400 metres of a limited range of shops and services. It is immediately adjacent to an industrial estate offering a range of employment although both primary and secondary schools are not conveniently located. I do not consider there are any fundamental constraints to development that could not be overcome or which would be likely to delay development on the site. Given my overall conclusions regarding the shortfall in the amount of phase 2 housing land I am of the view that the site's allocation would accord with RPG Policy H2 and advice in PPG3. I therefore conclude that no modification to the RDDP is necessary as far as the allocation or phasing of this site for housing is concerned.

### **Recommendation**

6.231 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of reference to the need to reserve approximately 1 hectare of the site for a new primary school.**

## **K/H2.2: Woodside Road, Silsden, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- As under Paragraph 3.0 at the beginning of this volume.
- The access from Woodside Road to the wider road network is via the difficult, dangerous and congested junction of Elliott Street with Keighley Road.
- The site should be re-allocated as a phase 1 site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.232 The site is allocated for housing (phase 2) in the FDDP only. In the RDDP it has been allocated as safeguarded land, and I consider the site under reference SOM/UR/5.14 above.

### **Recommendation**

**6.233 The recommendation concerning this site is given above under reference SOM/UR5.14.**

## **K/H2.3: North Dene Road, Silsden, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

<i>1608/1708</i>	<i>Miss S Foster</i>
<i>2031/3436</i>	<i>Mrs Dorothy Buffey</i>
<i>2455/2715</i>	<i>Mr J C Read</i>
<i>2461/7278</i>	<i>Mr D S Gray</i>
<i>2490/4992</i>	<i>Mr C Edwards</i>
<i>2491/7244</i>	<i>Mrs D J Laughton</i>
<i>2521/3374</i>	<i>John and Brenda Tyler</i>
<i>2553/5009</i>	<i>Mr L J Laughton</i>
<i>2614/2713</i>	<i>Silsden Town Council</i>
<i>2696/3285</i>	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
<i>3422/7056</i>	<i>Mrs Heather Wilkinson</i>
<i>3424/7064</i>	<i>Mr Keith Wilkinson</i>
<i>3715/11278</i>	<i>Mr G P Sloan</i>
<i>4280/4936</i>	<i>Ann Cryer MP</i>
<i>4330/7748</i>	<i>Mrs Enid Govier</i>
<i>4331/7741</i>	<i>Mr Paul Govier</i>
<i>4585/10169</i>	<i>Mr Richard Chatburn</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- As under 3.0 at the beginning of this volume.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.234 In the RDDP the allocation of this site has been changed to safeguarded land, and no objection has been made to this allocation. However the objections listed above have not been withdrawn. From the nature of the objections it appears to me that the RDDP allocation will not have satisfied the objections entirely. Accordingly I go on to consider the objections in the light of the RDDP allocation, which my conclusions at UR5.15 above support.

## **Recommendation**

6.235 **My recommendation is given under reference UR5.15 above.**

## **K/H2.4, K/H2.5, K/H2.6, SOM/K/GB1/76, SOM/K/GB1/26, SOM/K/GB1/27: Daisy Hill (West, Centre and East), Silsden, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- See under 3.0 above.
- The land should be tidied up and left as an amenity area/greenspace, or put in the Green Belt.
- A previously-developed site in Silsden should be substituted for these allocations.
- Houses in Middleway would be overlooked, and affected by flooding and construction disturbance, if this land was to be used for housing.
- Access is inadequate.
- Development should be brought forward to phase 1. The land is not really greenfield land.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.236 These sites are all open and therefore qualify as greenfield land. They are, however, within the built up area of Silsden because they have the housing development of Middleway to the south, houses to the north, and Silsden's main public open space to the west, beyond which is the Silsden local centre. They therefore differ from the other housing allocations in Silsden, and do not function as Green Belt. I have no evidence that these sites were ever in the Green Belt, and they should not be placed in the Green Belt.

6.237 For reasons which have been well rehearsed in the opening sections of this volume, there is no justification for general needs housing in Silsden. To meet local needs during the plan period, I recommend the allocation of land at Sykes Lane (see above), part of which is previously-developed land and part unkempt greenfield land within the settlement. In my judgement the Daisy Hill sites are less unattractive visually: the eastern site, for example, consists of 2 fields of pasture land with a dividing hedgerow.



- 6.238 I would expect the local needs of Silsden to require a significant amount of land for the period beyond the plan period, if the use of Green Belt land is to be avoided. The life of the Green Belt should extend for 10 years beyond that of the UDP. My view is that the Daisy Hill sites would be suitable for meeting this need but allocation as safeguarded land is not possible for sites within the built-up area.
- 6.239 The detailed objections to housing allocation are not sustainable. The amenity value of the land appears to me to be limited; apart from the permissive path along the south-western edge, any use by the public is ‘unofficial’. Bearing in mind the size of the settlement, and the 10 years for which safeguarded land is required, my assessment is that local need would outweigh amenity value. The playing fields nearby would be preserved.
- 6.240 Particular elements such as trees and hedgerows could be protected as part of any development. Design and other solutions are also available to deal with potential overlooking and construction disturbance. The sites are well-separated from Brunthwaite Conservation Area. Access is possible to both north and south without the use of Middleway, it seems to me. The proposed eastern bypass would not be necessary for access to be provided to this land, and any traffic problems affecting roads in the centre of Silsden would have to be analysed when the Daisy Hill sites are brought forward for firmer allocation as housing sites. The conversion/redevelopment of former mills in the centre of Silsden would go towards meeting the windfall allowance for the District.
- 6.241 The land is well above the River Aire floodplain and washlands. The rate of discharge of water draining from development could be controlled if necessary, and sewerage improved.
- 6.242 My overall conclusion is that these sites should not be allocated for housing for reasons of the relatively poor sustainability of the settlement of Silsden. The position of the sites could be reconsidered in a future review of the UDP.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.243 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the housing allocation from the 3 Daisy Hill sites.**

### **K/H2.7 and K/H2.8: Banklands Avenue, Silsden, Keighley**

#### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- As under 3.0 at the beginning of this volume.

#### **Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.244 The general arguments against allocating substantial areas for housing at Silsden are given above (see 3.3 et seq). The areas at Banklands Avenue are the largest allocations, comprise greenfield land, and should not be allocated for housing.

## Recommendation

**6.245 I recommend the RDDP be modified by the deletion of allocations K/H2.7 and 2.8. K/H2.9, SOM/K/CF3/30, SOM/K/OS2/30 & SOM/K/OS7/30: Chapel Street, Addingham**

## Objectors

2241/1999 & 2666      *Mr Benstead*  
2705/9853 & 9859      *Mrs Elizabeth Jane Whiteside*  
3217/7911 & 10794      *Mr G F Tose*  
4129/2963              *Arncliffe Homes Ltd*

## Summary of Objections

- The site needs to be developed sympathetically to provide additional amenities for village people, especially youngsters. Access to adjacent playing fields must be maintained and the adjacent conservation area enhanced.
- If the site is developed for further building heavy traffic would cause many problems.
- Only a few houses should be allowed and these should be affordable or in a mixed development.
- The land should be designated as village greenspace to avoid building houses that would over-stretch village amenities and infrastructure.
- Access to the site is narrow and picturesque and widening would have an horrendous impact.
- A health centre is needed, not more housing.
- The site should be in the first phase of housing development as this is a sustainable brownfield site which is sequentially preferable to greenfield sites.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.246 This former cleared school site is allocated as a phase 2 housing site within the RDDP. When judged against the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land within RPG Policy H2 Addingham is within a rural area where the provision of housing should be to meet local needs and/or support local services. Priority should be given to the re-use of previously-developed land and the conservation of the character of the village.
- 6.247 The site is previously-developed and is within ready walking distance of the limited shops, facilities and services within the village. Although I have seen no evidence relating to the question of local needs, this site is the only allocated site within the RDDP. Whilst the emphasis of national, regional and local policy is to concentrate development within the urban areas I consider it appropriate that some future housing provision should be made within this sizeable village. In light of my general conclusions on the locational and phasing aspects of housing within the Policy Framework volume of my report, and absence of evidence of a pressing local need, I consider the Council's choice of making this a phase 2 site to be the correct one.
- 6.248 Any proposal coming forward would need to take account of the possibility of provision of affordable housing as part of a residential proposal. Whilst I share the objectors' concerns about the constrictions on access to the site it needs to be borne in mind that as a previously-developed site there would have been traffic generated by the site's use. The Council indicates that a Traffic Assessment would be required to properly assess the implications and possible mitigation of traffic impact from what is a small site. This

would be a detailed planning consideration and I do not consider that, in itself, this matter should lead to a presumption against the site's allocation at this stage.

6.249 Any development on the site would have to be of a high standard and take account of the character and appearance of the conservation area that abuts it. Justification within the RDDP to the site's allocation emphasises the need to retain access to the adjacent playing fields. Within the context of RDDP Policy OS7 and PPG17 I do not consider this cleared site, with its areas of hardstanding, is a significant open greenspace within the village. The playing field to the rear of the site is protected within the plan under OS3. The plan does not specifically allocate community facilities such as health centres, these falling to be considered under Policy CF3.

6.250 It is therefore my overall view that the site is correctly allocated as a phase 2 housing site and that no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

### **Recommendation**

6.251 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/H2.12 & SOM/K/OS1/229: Higherwood Close, Long Lee, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

3842/6871 & 10100 *Taywood Homes Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site is more reasonably related to the designated urban greenspace in the RDDP, which is acknowledged as having significant recreational value and importance for the landscape setting of Keighley.
- The site is relatively remote from the major road network such that its development would be likely to increase traffic on intervening roads to the detriment of highway safety.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.252 The site of about 1 hectare was a phase 2 housing allocation within the FDDP but was changed to safeguarded land within the RDDP (K/UR5.17). It has the open land of Parkwood urban greenspace (UGS) to the north, the west, and, effectively, to the east as well. The objection land is open and forms part of the steep slope falling from Long Lee down to Parkwood Street. The slope is wooded, the objection land less so, but natural regeneration of trees and shrubs is well advanced over much of the site. There are a number of informal paths across the site, leading into the UGS. The whole area of undeveloped land appears to be used informally for recreation.

6.253 In my opinion the objection site shares the characteristics of the UGS, the public value of which the Council acknowledges. I note that the previous UDP Inspector described development of the site as an urban extension, and not as infill or rounding off. He saw development as a logical extension of the urban area, but since then a revised version of PPG17 has been issued. The objection land falls within the definition of UGS given in the Annex to the PPG. In my view residential development on the site would represent a

prominent and harmful incursion into the UGS. Furthermore, access to the site would be via the presently unmade and, in parts, narrow residential road of Spring Avenue. This in turn leads onto the very steep, winding and extensively cobbled Thwaite Brow Road. Because of its location in relation to this road residential development on the objection site would be likely to increase its use. From the point of view of highway safety, I consider this would represent an additional drawback of allocating the site.

6.254 I have reached conclusions in the Policy Framework volume of my report about the RDDP's overall level of housing allocations and the amount of safeguarded land that is likely to be necessary to ensure the permanence of the Green Belt boundary. I have also concluded that land within the urban area and not abutting the Green Belt should not be allocated as safeguarded land. Although I have identified a shortfall in the plan's phase 2 housing provision I consider the limited contribution this site could make to rectifying this is outweighed by the disadvantages I have noted. As a consequence, I consider the safeguarded land designation should be deleted and the site added to the Parkwood UGS designation K/OS1.7.

### **Recommendation**

6.255 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.17 and the site's re-allocation as part of the Parkwood urban greenspace (K/OS1.7).**

### **K/H2.14: Moss Carr Road, Long Lee, Keighley (K/UR5.19 and SOM/K/H1/421)**

#### **Objectors**

2983/6954                      *Mr Keith Robinson*  
3842/6704                      *Taywood Homes Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be allocated in phase 1 to meet the shortfall.
- There is capacity at Coney Lane Bridge to cater for additional housing and the site is of sufficient scale to make an effective contribution to the delivery of improvement measures.
- The site was designated as Green Belt. Long Lee School has closed, roads and infrastructure are inadequate and there would be general disruption to the local environment.
- As the site has been under 'planning permission' for at least 30 years it must not be a viable proposition.
- The main road into Keighley, and Coney Lane Bridge over the River Worth, are not suitable for the additional traffic that would result from residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.256 This site, comprising a series of pasture fields on the eastern edge of Long Lee, was carried forward as a housing allocation from the adopted UDP into the FDDP. Its phase 2 allocation was, however, changed to safeguarded land within the RDDP as a result of the reduction in the housing requirement for Bradford District as set out in the approved RPG12, and the Council's sustainability appraisal. The site has not had a Green Belt

designation in either the Upper Airedale Local Plan or the adopted UDP, nor has it benefited from any previous planning permission. It represents a greenfield extension to the urban form of Keighley

- 6.257 The objector, Taywood Homes, has queried the Council's overall assessments and allocations of housing land, particularly in respect of deliverability of housing provision. I have considered these matters in the Policy Framework volume of my report where I have concluded that the phase 1 housing requirement can be met by more sustainable sites. There is therefore no requirement to allocate the objection land as a phase 1 site.
- 6.258 The previous UDP Inspector concluded that the site is reasonably related to the built-up area of Long Lee. In relation to Long Lee this may be so. However, in terms of RPG Policy H2 the site falls only within the fourth category of 5 in the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land. Having regard to paragraph 31 of PPG3 the site is not particularly well served by services and facilities, these being limited within the Long Lee area. It is my view that the site is too remote (about 2.5 km) from the wide range offered by the town centre for walking to be a realistic option for daily functional needs. This is particularly so as perceptions of ease and distance will be affected by the presence of the long steep hill down to Coney Lane Bridge. To my mind this would also apply to cycling for utility purposes. However, the site is within ready walking distance of a bus service through Long Lee to Keighley and beyond.
- 6.259 The Council indicates that in terms of infrastructure the provision of a separate drainage system would be needed for the site. I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that the site could not be adequately developed subject to such a system or that the roads within Long Lee could not cope with additional traffic that might result from further housing. Although Long Lee First School has closed there are 3 other schools within 3 kilometres that are well served by local bus routes. Overall, I consider the site to be rather poorly placed in terms of general sustainability criteria.
- 6.260 A further reason for the Council changing the allocation of this site to safeguarded land, (together with that of 5 other previously allocated housing sites), is the perceived capacity limitations of and close to Coney Lane Bridge. I have considered this matter in relation to another Long Lee objection site (K/UR5.22) where I have concluded that in respect of allocating land as a phase 2 housing site the Coney Lane Bridge situation should not be seen as a constraint. Nevertheless, whilst I have identified an overall shortfall in the plan's phase 2 provision I do not consider the site's sustainability characteristics are such as to warrant bringing it forward from its present safeguarded status. I consider there are no compelling reasons to alter this conclusion in respect of this site. No modification to the RDDP is therefore necessary.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.261 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/H2.17: Park Lane, Parkwood, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

3842/6709

*Taywood Homes Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objection**

---

- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.262 I have considered this objection in relation to K/UR5.22 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

**6.263 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.22 and its replacement as a phase 2 housing allocation.**

### **K/H2.19: Hainworth Wood Road, Woodhouse, Keighley**

#### **Objectors**

2634/2698	<i>Mrs Patricia M Preshaw</i>
2637/2696	<i>Dr John M Preshaw</i>
4993/12608	<i>West Yorkshire Ecology</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- There would be a loss of Green Belt and development would result in increased traffic and sewage.
- The site is of ecological interest and should be covered by Policy UR5.
- Gingerbread Clough should be protected by a buffer zone.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.264 This is the eastern half of what was within the FDDP the split housing allocation K/H2.19. The western half is now allocated as safeguarded land and I have considered objections relating to this by the same objectors under K/UR5.23.

6.265 The site is carried forward as a housing site from the adopted UDP and represents a greenfield extension to the urban form of Keighley. It is not and never has been part of the Green Belt. The land is an urban extension in the sequential approach to housing land allocation. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of my report that there are insufficient sites allocated on previously-developed land and within the urban areas to meet the plan's housing requirements so sites like this need to be considered. It lies adjacent to another greenfield site off Hainworth Road, K/H2.18, to which no objections have been made and which will therefore be likely to be an allocation within the plan. Although I consider that by reason of its location the site is only moderately placed in sustainability terms, I have seen no evidence to suggest that there are any particular highway or other infrastructure constraints or that the site could not be acceptably developed.

6.266 Nor have I seen evidence to support the contention by West Yorkshire Ecology that this mainly grassed field is of ecological importance. However, as the site is suggested to be allocated in phase 2 there would be plenty of opportunity in the interim for the field to be surveyed to establish whether or not this is the case. Gingerbread Clough, forming the

south-western boundary of the site, is recognised as an important ecological and landscape feature, being part of the larger Hainworth Wood Bradford Wildlife Area. Other plan policies, such as NE9, D1 and D5, should ensure that any development proposal paid due regard to the protection of this feature.

6.267 Overall, I conclude that the objection land should be allocated as a phase 2 housing site. Since the site would not have a frontage to Hainworth Wood Road, but would instead be able to gain this from Hainworth Road, the only modification to the RDDP that is needed is to amend the description of the site.

### **Recommendation**

6.268 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than deletion of the word “Wood” from the site description.**

### **K/H2.20: Spring Gardens Lane, Utley, Keighley**

#### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- There would be an adverse impact on residential amenity, character of the area, views and infrastructure, (including drainage, sewers, flooding and run-off).
- Development would involve loss of a green field of agricultural value, woodland character, natural habitat and Green Belt.
- There is concern about dangerous access, congestion, road safety, car parking, topography and land stability.
- Brownfield sites should be developed to protect land that is of landscape value and greenfield sites.
- The land represents a change from urban to rural character and complies with open space policies within the RDDP. The site is in, or adjacent to, a conservation area.

#### **Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.269 This is a roughly rectangular, very steeply sloping grassed field within the urban form of Keighley. The site is not, and never has been, designated as Green Belt. Nor is the land part of the Devonshire Park Conservation Area, situated further to the south-east.

6.270 There is insufficient previously-developed land and conversions within the district to complete phase 2. Therefore sites such as this come into the reckoning to make good this deficit, subject to judgement about their contribution to sustainable development principles, and environmental constraints.

6.271 In my view the site is not well placed having regard to sustainability criteria, being some 1.5 kilometres from the centre of Keighley where there is a concentration of shops, services, facilities and employment opportunities, and the nearest primary school being about 1.2 kilometres distance. There is only an hourly daytime bus service between Keighley and Silsden along Spring Gardens Lane and the site is beyond an 800-metre radius of Keighley station.

- 6.272 There are 2 rows of mature trees within the site, one along the Spring Gardens frontage and the second along the western site boundary, the former being protected by a long-standing Tree Preservation Order. For most of the road frontage there is no footpath and the carriageway narrows somewhat. The trees are very close to the present boundary wall. The only realistic means of forming a vehicular access would be from Spring Gardens Lane. I consider it probable that the formation of a suitable access, with possible widening of Spring Gardens Lane and the accommodation of a footway along its northern side, would necessitate removal of some or all of these trees. I accept that such a matter would be one for resolution at the detailed planning stage. Nevertheless, I am of the opinion that these trees are a particularly significant feature within the street scene whose loss would seriously detract from the area.
- 6.273 There are panoramic views across the site in a northerly direction over the Aire valley and the site imparts a sense of openness to the area, whether viewed from Spring Gardens Lane or the public footpath to its eastern side. Although I do not believe that the land represents part of the transition between urban and rural forms, I consider that for the above reasons the site, with its trees and in its present open state, is important to both the character and appearance of the area. It should be appropriately regarded as an extension of the adjoining urban greenspace.
- 6.274 To a degree I also share the concerns of some objectors that the steep gradient down the site would make the provision of vehicular access within it difficult. Nevertheless, I have seen no evidence to suggest that suitable engineering solutions would not be possible, although these may themselves involve considerable remodelling of the land to provide more acceptable gradients. As any development would incorporate appropriate parking standards I do not believe parking problems or congestion that, on occasion, may occur on Spring Gardens Lane would be made materially worse. Solutions would be possible, I am sure, to overcome expressed concerns regarding drainage, and the protection of existing residential amenity, particularly for residents in Manor Road and Aireville Close.
- 6.275 I have seen no evidence to suggest that the field has any particular ecological value although the Council may wish to arrange surveys to evaluate this. Impact on rateable values and the possible devaluation of properties are not planning issues. Even if development were to take place, the site is relatively small and its steepness and relationship with existing housing would be likely to impose constraints on the number of units that could be accommodated. Its contribution to the district's overall housing provision would therefore be very modest.
- 6.276 It is my overall conclusion that this site in its present form is important to the appearance and character of the area and that for the reasons given residential development would be likely to be seriously harmful to these. Having regard to RPG Policy H2 I do not think the character of this particular urban area would be preserved if it were to be allocated for housing. I consider that this consideration outweighs any modest contribution the site could make to the plan's phase 2 housing provision. Adding this land, together with the adjacent public footpath, to the adjoining urban greenspace would, in my view, be more appropriate.

## **Recommendation**



**6.277 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the land's allocation as a housing site and its addition, together with the public footpath to its eastern side, to the adjoining urban greenspace notation on the Proposals Map.**

**K/H2.21: Hollins Lane, Utley, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land is important to the setting of Hollins Lane, representing the change from urban to rural on the departure from Keighley to the Aire valley.
- The site is close to a 4-way staggered road junction and additional traffic would exacerbate safety problems and congestion, with Hollins Lane being narrow and frequently having parked cars along it.
- A water main bisects the site, there are flooding problems, and many mature trees. There could be a serious impact on the bat population. Valuable grazing land would be lost.
- Public transport close to the site is very limited. Local schools are already at capacity.
- Development would result in overlooking of existing houses.
- Brownfield land should be used before greenfield.
- Danger to young children from ponds at Whinburn.
- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site and should include field No. 8749 to the south-west, and that part of field No. 9259, which is not presently included.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.278 The above objections were made in response to the land's allocation as a phase 2 housing site within the FDDP. Within the RDDP the allocation was changed to that of safeguarded land. I have considered objections to that allocation, many of which repeat concerns expressed in connection with its allocation for housing, in connection with K/UR5.24 above, to which reference should be made. I have considered the allocation of field No. 8749 and part of field No. 9259 in relation to SOM/K/H1/113 above.

### **Recommendation**

**6.279 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/H2.22, SOM/K/GB1/35, SOM/K/H1/35 & K/UR5.25: Shann Lane, Black Hill, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

2075/2373 & 2011     *Mr Henry Pettinger*  
2634/10902 & 2009     *Mrs Patricia M Preshaw*  
2637/2371 & 11247     *Dr John M Preshaw*  
3839/6783             *Bryant Homes Northern Ltd*  
4196/7027             *Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be re-allocated as Green Belt/Area of Landscape Value as it forms an important break between High Utley and Higher Shann and development would result in more urban sprawl.
- Development would result in surface water drainage and highway problems.
- The site is greenfield, is not in a sustainable location, and development would undermine the objective of developing previously-developed land.
- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site as there is a shortage in supply, the land is within the Keighley urban area, there are no constraints to development and off-site highway improvements would be of wider community benefit. Failing this it should be a phase 2 allocation.
- Development would result in loss of privacy through overlooking of existing housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.280 Within the adopted UDP the objection land was allocated as a constrained housing site and this was carried forward to the FDDP as a phase 2 allocation. The publication of the approved RPG12 containing a reduced figure for the average annual housing requirement for the district, and the Council's assessment of the site's sustainability, resulted in it becoming designated as safeguarded land within the RDDP.

6.281 This greenfield site is surrounded on 3 sides by existing built development, with its western boundary having a frontage to Shann Lane. In my view it is within the urban form of Keighley. Whilst providing a current open break in development I do not consider retention of the site as primarily open fields is crucial to the form, appearance or character of this part of Keighley. There would be no loss of Green Belt since the land has never been so designated. The question of overlooking of properties is a detailed planning matter that would be considered if and when a planning application was to be made. The protection of private views from dwellings is not a planning matter.

6.282 There are many other potential urban sites which could be used to make up the plan's phase 1 housing requirement. Hence it is necessary, in accordance with RPG Policy H2, to test the comparative sustainability of the site.

6.283 The nearest primary school is about 1 km away although there are secondary schools that are nearer. The site lies about 1.5 km from the centre of Keighley with its range of shops, services, facilities and sources of employment, this distance involving the negotiation of long hills. There are very limited shopping or other services within more convenient walking distance, particularly given the sloping terrain. The nearest bus route is about 50 metres from the south-western corner of the site and a service runs hourly. There is a second, more frequent, service but this is about 450 metres from the nearest southern part of the site. Access to this would involve the negotiation of quite steeply sloping routes, which in my view would affect perception of distance and act as a deterrent to use. I therefore consider that access to the site by public transport cannot be described as good. In comparison with the best performing urban greenfield sites for which I have detailed evidence, such as those in Ilkley and Queensbury, and which I consider should be allocated as phase 1 housing sites, the objection land is markedly less sustainable. On this basis I do not consider allocation as a phase 1 site is justified.

6.284 Although concerns have been expressed about the effect of development on drainage I have no reason to doubt that means would be available to achieve a satisfactory drainage solution. These could involve the control of flow within the site rather than necessitating off-site works. Concerns have also been voiced about the highway safety implications of

any development. However, from the evidence presented I accept that a satisfactory means of access to the site from Shann Lane could be formed and that the site's development would not result in an over-burdening of the local highway network. The present junction arrangement of Shann Lane and Spring Gardens Lane is less than ideal and development on the site would be likely to necessitate improvements to this to prevent additional vehicle conflict. I am satisfied that this could be achieved and this could result in a wider, but limited, community benefit from the objection land's development through the creation of a safer and more commodious junction arrangement. However, in my view this in itself would not be sufficient to elevate the objection land for consideration as a phase 1 allocation.

6.285 The Council changed the objection land's designation from a phase 2 site to safeguarded land on the basis of a supposed sufficiency of housing land supply. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of this report that this assumption is incorrect and that there is in fact a District-wide deficiency in the phase 2 supply. Since the land is an urban greenfield site, and despite reservations about the relative sustainability of the site, it is my overall view that it should be allocated as a phase 2 site. Accordingly, the RDDP should be modified to this effect.

### **Recommendation**

6.286 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.25 and the substitution of a phase 2 housing allocation.**

**K/H2.23 & SOM/K/GB1/36: North Dean Avenue, Braithwaite, Keighley (SOM/K/H1/36 & K/UR5.26)**

### **Objectors**

1459/3252	<i>English Heritage</i>
2634/2369 & 2014	<i>Mrs Patricia M Preshaw</i>
2637/2368 & 2013	<i>Dr John M Preshaw</i>
4225/2992	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs K Marshall</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be reallocated as a phase 1 housing site.
- There would be a loss of Green Belt, and grazing land, spoiling of the countryside, and damage to views of the edge of Keighley
- Development would lead to increased traffic and sewage.
- Development would compromise the open landscaped setting of Braithwaite Village and the listed buildings within the southern part of the conservation area there.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.287 My conclusions regarding the allocation of the site for housing purposes are set out under objection reference SOM/K/H1/36 above where I have agreed with the Council's proposal within the RDDP that it be designated as safeguarded land.

6.288 This designation would not result in the loss of Green Belt as the site has never been designated as such within an adopted development plan, the Green Belt boundary being

drawn along the western and southern edges of the site. As safeguarded land the site is likely to remain undeveloped until after the end of the plan period. If residential development were to take place this would lead to an extension of the urban edge of this part of Keighley and I accept that this would be prominent from elevated viewpoints to the south and west. Nevertheless, there is a need to ensure an adequacy of safeguarded land to cater for development needs well beyond the plan period. It would be for detailed planning control to ensure a satisfactory and fitting transition between built development and the open countryside beyond. I consider the need to provide safeguarded land outweighs the landscape impact that development here might have. I have seen no evidence to suggest that the local infrastructure would be incapable of accommodating development on the site.

6.289 The northern site boundary approaches close to, and at one point encroaches into, the defined Braithwaite Conservation Area. English Heritage has suggested that to avoid harming the landscape setting of the village the northern part of the allocation as a housing site should be deleted. This objection has not been withdrawn in the light of the Council's suggested safeguarded land designation.

6.290 I accept that one of the principal characteristics of the Braithwaite Conservation Area is its essentially rural setting. Although at its eastern end the village is now contiguous with the built edge of Keighley it is from the south and west that the impression is gained of a more freestanding rural hamlet of predominantly stone-built houses and barns on an elevated ridge. This is assisted by the open views across fields to the south and mature hedgerows on the north-western part of the objection site. I consider that this setting would be seriously compromised by residential development extending very close to the area's southern boundary, particularly when seen from the public footpath joining North Dean Avenue and Laycock – part of the Millenium Way Circular Walk – and from more distant views. The fact that existing development in Braithwaite would prevent most views from within the conservation area of any housing on the site does not deflect from this conclusion.

6.291 The safeguarded land allocation will ensure that no development takes place for quite some time. However, because of the importance I attach to the setting of the Braithwaite Conservation Area I consider the Council should carefully ensure that any built development that might compromise this does not take place on the northern portion of the site.

## **Recommendation**

6.292 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **K/H2.24: Occupation Lane (West), Exley Head, Keighley**

### **Objectors**

14/7446	<i>Mr Peter C Scull</i>
293/2364	<i>Mr Robert William Cockshott</i>
2509/10928	<i>Elders and Trustees Trinity URC</i>
4227/2987	<i>Helez Properties Ltd</i>
4228/2983	<i>Trustees of Frank Sugden Decd.</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- Object to any development on the site, with concern as to where traffic would go.
- The site should be allocated for phase 1 housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.293 I have considered these objections in relation to K/UR5.27 with SOM/K/H1/37, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

6.294 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/H2.25: Occupation Lane (East), Exley Head, Keighley**

#### **Objectors**

14/7444	<i>Mr Peter C Scull</i>
4227/2985	<i>Helez Properties Ltd</i>
4228/2976	<i>Trustees of Frank Sugden Decd.</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be allocated for housing as a phase 1 site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.295 I have considered these objections in relation to K/UR5.28 with SOM/K/H1/277, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

6.296 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/H2.27: Maple Avenue, Oakworth, Keighley**

#### **Objectors**

1459/3254	<i>English Heritage</i>
1696/2086	<i>Mrs Z Thomas</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The housing allocation should be deleted as it would be detrimental to the character of the village and conservation area.
- It would be a clear incursion into the countryside and would set a precedent for the release of other sites.
- Access is narrow, there is congestion with parking in connection with the school, and the school lacks capacity.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.297 Within the RDDP the objection land is allocated as a phase 2 housing site. However, a residential planning permission granted in December 1998 was implemented and a subsequent appeal against the refusal of another residential planning permission was allowed in August 2002. Construction is currently underway and both of the objections, which are concerned with the principle of development on the land, are therefore academic. I agree with the Council's suggestion that the site should now be more appropriately allocated as a phase 1 housing site.

## **Recommendation**

6.298 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting the site's phase 2 housing allocation and substituting for it a phase 1 allocation.**

**K/H2.28, SOM/K/UR5/77 & SOM/K/OS7/77: Mill Lane, Oakworth, Keighley (now, in part, K/UR5.30)**

## **Objectors**

1459/3262 & 5971	<i>English Heritage</i>
1824/526	<i>Mrs P Pickles</i>
2402/2361	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs J Gill</i>
2434/2362	<i>Miss Colette Louise Shepherd</i>
2838/3303	<i>Mr Trevor Townson</i>
2918/6934	<i>Mrs Ann Crumblehulme</i>
2919/7828	<i>Mrs Jean Donisthorpe</i>
2988/7867	<i>Mrs M Clayton</i>
3194/7906	<i>Mr Lambert</i>
3712/7988	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs P &amp; C Gannon</i>
4069/7998	<i>Mrs D Moorby</i>
4110/5257	<i>Ms Mary Smith</i>
4112/5258	<i>Mr Norman Fleming</i>
4114/5259	<i>Mr Mark Newton</i>
4115/5260	<i>Mr Graham Wilkinson</i>
4396/7453 & 7454	<i>Mrs J M Armstrong</i>
4557/10000	<i>Mr C E Mace</i>

## **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be deleted from the plan and allocated as safeguarded land or as village greenspace.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.299 In the FDDP the whole site was a phase 2 housing allocation (K/H2.28). Within the RDDP the western single field is now designated as land safeguarded for longer-term development (K/UR5.30), whilst the eastern section is unallocated. Most of the objections are to the suggested allocation of the land for housing within the FDDP and have not been withdrawn.

- 6.300 There have been no duly made objections to the designation of part of the site as safeguarded land, other than English Heritage's view that the land should be allocated as village greenspace. This is on the basis that the site was included within the Oakworth Conservation Area because of its contribution to the character of this part of the settlement and the setting of the listed mill building and its associated cottages. A village greenspace notation under Policy OS7 would prevent residential development that could be damaging to this character and setting.
- 6.301 Justification to Policy OS7 states that areas of village greenspace have been allocated where they have important local amenity value, contributing to the setting or character of the village. Development may be harmful particularly where the land is very prominent within the village or where it possesses good tree cover. This site is not in itself prominent from within the village, topography and enclosure by existing development preventing this. It does not have any tree cover. I accept that the land does have a function in providing some views towards the mill complex and providing a setting for it from the footpath to its eastern edge. However, the safeguarded land notation would ensure no development takes place on this site for some time, since the plan expects that such land will remain in its existing use during the plan period. The existing conservation area and listed status of the mill complex would also impose obligations to ensure that any eventual development respected the appearance, character and setting of these buildings. Consequently, I do not consider the re-designation of the safeguarded land as village greenspace to be appropriate.
- 6.302 As safeguarded land the site should be genuinely capable of development in the future should the need arise. Various objections made to the designation of the land as a housing allocation have questioned its suitability for such a purpose. I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that there would be any insuperable infrastructure constraints on the site's eventual development, including the provision of suitable access. Protection of existing residential amenity and the visual impact of any development are matters for detailed planning consideration. The Council has not indicated that the presence of a former landfill site to the east would pose a constraint to development. This has clearly not hindered the recent development of housing in Heritage Way closer to the landfill.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.303 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/H2.30:      Worstead Road, Bocking, Keighley (now K/UR5.31)**

## **Objectors**

1742/3243                      *Haworth Parish Council*  
4205/3021                      *Mr T J Blackburn*

## **Summary of Objections**

- The site should not be allocated for housing as it would be an intrusive, unsustainable major extension of the built-up area.
- There would be coalescence of the communities of Barcroft and Bocking and increased traffic congestion.

- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site, being in a sustainable location served by a good bus service to Keighley and being within a reasonable distance of services and facilities.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.304 Within the adopted UDP the objection land was allocated for housing and this was carried forward as a phase 2 site within the FDDP. The publication of the approved RPG12 containing a reduced figure for the average annual housing requirement for the district, and the Council's assessment of the site's sustainability, resulted in it becoming safeguarded land within the RDDP.
- 6.305 The site is not within an urban area. There is a sufficiency of supply of land for phase 1 residential development from sites which are higher up the sequential approach hierarchy. Therefore there is no requirement for this site to be so allocated.
- 6.306 I have also concluded that there is an insufficient supply of safeguarded land to ensure that development needs beyond the plan period can be catered for without requiring the Green Belt boundary to be altered. This has led to my recommendation that a full-scale review be undertaken by the Council of the Green Belt to encompass sufficient safeguarded land. The land is not part of the Green Belt, it is close to Halifax Road, which is well served by bus routes to Keighley and beyond, and is close to a primary school and to a limited range of services in Cross Roads/Lees.
- 6.307 Although housing on the site would extend the built form of the settlement it is already contained for much of 3 sides by existing development and would only be readily apparent in views from across the Worth Valley. Development would require a separate off-site drainage system and to provide adequate access to Halifax Road an existing industrial building would need to be demolished. I have no reason to believe that additional traffic that might be generated by residential development on the site could not be accommodated by the local road system. Nor am I aware of any major constraints that would cause the land to not be genuinely available for future development.
- 6.308 Given this background and the site's characteristics, I consider that the objection land should remain as a safeguarded land allocation for future appraisal. No modification to the RDDP is therefore necessary.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.309 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/H2.31: Off Lees Lane (North), Haworth, Keighley (SOM/K/H1/38 & SOM/K/OS7/38)**

#### **Objectors**

23/2360	<i>Mrs M Gratton</i>
25/2352	<i>Mr W Gratton</i>
782/11248	<i>Mr Andrew Wood</i>
1396/515	<i>Mr David Hutchinson</i>
1742/3241	<i>Haworth Parish Council</i>



2120/2359	<i>Mrs S Palmer</i>
2123/2358	<i>Mr Ian Palmer</i>
2438/2357	<i>Mr David Robertson-Brown</i>
3123/3261	<i>Mr Keith C Wilson</i>
4113/5262	<i>Mrs G Robertson-Brown</i>
4121/7236	<i>Mr Davies</i>
4123/7235	<i>Ms Patricia Dunford</i>
4146/7180	<i>Skipton Properties Ltd</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- Development would extend onto the Green Belt and would result in the overloading of infrastructure.
- The site should not be allocated for housing as there is ample provision on brownfield sites elsewhere.
- There would be an unacceptable visual impact, including that on the setting of Longlands and views of Haworth from it, and development would impinge on Murgatroyd Wood, an important wildlife and landscape feature.
- The site should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.310 Excepting those of Skipton Properties Ltd all the objections consider that the site should be not allocated for housing and were made in response to its designation for this purpose within the FDDP. Within the RDDP the allocation has been changed to that of village greenspace. In that this designation will offer protection to the site under Policy OS7 I consider that this satisfies those objections expressing concern related to the impact of further housing on it. I have considered the objection by Skipton Properties Ltd under SOM/K/H1/38 above.

### **Recommendation**

6.311 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/H2.32: Off Lees Lane (South), Haworth, Keighley (K/UR5.32, SOM/K/BH7/39, SOM/K/OS1/39, SOM/K/OS7/39 and SOM/K/H1/39)**

### **Objectors**

89/2351	<i>Ms Gill Penny</i>
782/2353	<i>Mr Andrew Wood</i>
1396/516	<i>Mr David Hutchinson</i>
1742/3239	<i>Haworth Parish Council</i>
2120/2354	<i>Mrs S Palmer</i>
2123/2356	<i>Mr Ian Palmer</i>
2438/9471	<i>Mr David Robertson-Brown</i>
2457/3926	<i>Mrs M H Merrett</i>
2458/7200	<i>Mr R R P and Mrs A L Ackroyd</i>
3123/3263	<i>Mr Keith C Wilson</i>
3876/6554	<i>Mr A R Merrett</i>
4113/5261	<i>Mrs G Robertson-Brown</i>
4121/7237	<i>Mr Davies</i>
4123/7234	<i>Ms Patricia Dunford</i>

---

4146/7181  
4614/10191

*Skipton Properties Ltd*  
*Mr A J Adams*

## **Summary of Objections**

- The site is greenfield. Development would be unsustainable and would contravene various UDP policies.
- There would be amenity problems because of the relationship of existing housing nearby.
- Coupled with other new development housing would put a strain on traffic on the Lees Lane route to Keighley.
- It would result in the loss of a visually important green space, which should be kept.
- Development would be incompatible with adjacent industrial buildings.
- The land should be allocated as a phase 1 housing site as there is an insufficient supply identified, it is in a sustainable location and is a natural extension to the adjacent housing site that has been developed.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.312 The objection land was an allocated housing site within the FDDP and it was in respect of this allocation that most of the objections to housing development were made. The Council changed the land's allocation to safeguarded land within the RDDP. This was on the basis of a supposed adequacy of housing land supply within the plan period and the need to provide for development in the years beyond to ensure that the Green Belt boundary endured. The land lies within the settlement of Haworth/Lees and does not abut the Green Belt, being separated from it by existing housing and Hebden Road to its southern side. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of my report that the 'safeguarding' of all such land should be deleted as it does not accord with PPG2 advice.
- 6.313 Haworth is not part of the urban area, the RDDP classifying it as a less well located settlement. Taking into account the sites I am recommending should be allocated as phase 1 sites there is no requirement to allocate those which are not within urban areas.
- 6.314 In terms of Policy H2 of RPG12 the site comes well down the hierarchy in the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land. Although close to reasonably frequent bus service routes, these do not offer the 10-minute frequency that the Council considers to be good. The range of shops, services and sources of employment within ready walking distance is limited. In my view, the sustainability characteristics of the site do not override the broader locational considerations.
- 6.315 There are likely to be only two phase 1 housing sites in Haworth (K/H1.35, now fully developed, and K/H1.36 where planning permission has been implemented), and no phase 2 sites. Nevertheless, I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest that there is a need for further housing to meet local needs that would favour the land being allocated ahead of more sustainably located sites within the urban areas. The fact that there are no constraints on the site's development, with infrastructure within the adjacent site K/H1.35 already in place to serve future development, is not sufficient to dissuade me from the view that the land should not be allocated for housing.
- 6.316 The objection land is a slightly sloping, roughly grassed field largely contained on 3 sides by existing development. Because of this containment and the general lie of the land I

consider it is somewhat distinct from the wider area of more open land to the south-west which is designated as village greenspace. Views into and across the site are limited, there is no public access across the land, and in terms of PPG17 I do not consider that it makes a significant contribution to the setting, character, appearance or general quality of the settlement. Accordingly, I share the Council's view that allocation as an extension of the adjacent village greenspace is not warranted.

6.317 Overall, I therefore consider that the safeguarded land allocation should be deleted and the land left unallocated. Any proposals that were to be made for development on the land would need to be judged against other plan policies, including Policy UR4.

### **Recommendation**

6.318 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.32.**

**K/H2.33: Ashlar Close, Haworth, Keighley (SOM/K/CF3/78, SOM/K/OS1/78, SOM/K/OS7/78)**

### **Objectors**

782/2348	<i>Mr Andrew Wood</i>
1742/3237	<i>Haworth Parish Council</i>
2120/2350	<i>Mrs S Palmer</i>
2123/2349	<i>Mr Ian Palmer</i>
3123/3275	<i>Mr Keith C Wilson</i>
4121/7238	<i>Mr Davies</i>
4123/7233	<i>Ms Patricia Dunford</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- Further development would not be in keeping with the existing character and heritage of Haworth and would conflict with the plan's policies.
- The site is a new greenfield one that is not in the adopted UDP. Brownfield sites should be developed first.
- There is inadequate infrastructure. More housing would add to the problems of access and parking.
- The site is an important wildlife and landscape buffer between Haworth and Lees/Cross Roads.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.319 The site was allocated for housing within the FDDP and it is in relation to this that objections were made. The allocation was changed to that of safeguarded land within the RDDP, to which there were no duly made objections. The site lies within the settlement of Haworth/Lees and not on its edge adjacent to the Green Belt. I have concluded in the Policy Framework volume of my report that the 'safeguarding' of all such land should be deleted as it does not accord with PPG2 advice.

6.320 The site presently comprises an open grassed field together with a small stone-built workshop, domestic garden and landscaped public footpath. I have seen no substantive

evidence to suggest that the site is, as claimed, important for wildlife. In my view, because of its enclosure by residential development to the immediate east and west, and boundary features to the north, it is of different character to the more open and expansive land further to the north, which is allocated as village greenspace. Whether viewed at close quarters or more distantly I agree with the Council's assessment that it has little to contribute to the quality or appearance of the settlement. Other than along the footpath at its southern end there is no public access to it. It would not therefore be appropriate for the land to be added to the adjacent village greenspace. Consequently, I conclude that the land should remain unallocated. Any proposals that were to be made for development on the land would need to be judged against other policies of the plan, including Policy UR4.

## **Recommendation**

**6.321 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.33.**

**K/H2.34: Butt Lane, Haworth, Keighley (SOM/K/H1/40, SOM/K/CL3/40, SOM/K/CF3/40, SOM/K/TM/23/40, SOM/K/BH7/40 & SOM/K/OS2/40)**

## **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

## **Summary of Objections**

- The site's allocation for housing should be deleted and the existing buildings used for community, educational or small business purposes.
- The site should be within the conservation area.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.322 Comprising former Victorian school buildings and grounds this site was allocated as a phase 2 housing site within the FDDP and it was in response to this that objections were made. This allocation was deleted within the RDDP, the buildings and grounds becoming unallocated on the basis of the Council's reassessment of housing requirements in the light of RPG12. As a consequence, many objections were withdrawn although there are numerous ones still extant.

6.323 Some of the buildings are in active use as a dwelling, community centre and pre-school nursery. As the land is now unallocated any proposals for changes of use of the buildings or their grounds, including those for any other or additional community uses, would be subject to normal development control considerations and judgement against relevant plan policies.

6.324 The site is not currently within the Haworth Conservation Area and the Replacement UDP is not the vehicle for the designation or review of such areas. However, the Council has undertaken a re-appraisal independent of the UDP process and it is intended that the site be included within the conservation area. If this takes place then the Council will have strengthened powers to control future development on the site, including control over demolition.

6.325 In light of the changes made within the RDDP I do not consider any further modifications to be necessary, other than any approved amendments to the conservation area boundary being shown on the Proposals Map.

### **Recommendation**

6.326 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than any approved amendment to the conservation area boundary being shown on the Proposals Map.**

**K/H2.35: Weavers Hill, Haworth, Keighley (SOM/K/BH7/41, SOM/K/CF3/41, SOM/K/OS2/41 & SOM/K/GB1/41)**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- Development would harm the rural character, conservation area, heritage and visual amenity of Haworth.
- The open pasture in a central position in the village is a tourist attraction near Haworth Old Hall.
- Development would have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.
- There would be poor access, increased traffic levels, congestion, noise, road safety issues, damage to surfaces by traffic, and parking problems.
- There is inadequate infrastructure and danger of flooding.
- There would be loss of a footpath, recreational area and wildlife habitat.
- Development would be unsustainable and should be directed towards brownfield sites.
- Development would be a major extension of the built form eroding the Green Belt, would be visually intrusive, and would lead to the merging of communities.
- Additional housing is unjustified and the existing stock is difficult to sell. There would be conflict with other UDP policies.
- There has been incompetence of Council staff in dealing with the problems of the junction of Weavers' Hill and Sun Street.
- Development could lead to increased criminal activity.
- The site is of considerable importance to the landscape setting of Haworth Conservation Area and development could harm this area contrary to PPG15.
- Development could have significant adverse impact on cultural heritage and would generate a significant number of car trips. Haworth is locationally less well favoured and a gas main crosses the site.
- PPG2 and the replacement UDP support the review of Green Belts and replacing sites previously excluded back in the Green Belt.
- The site safeguards the countryside from encroachment and so fulfils a Green Belt function. A more enduring boundary would be the access road to the car park.
- To accord with PPG3 greenfield sites such as this should be the final option for development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.327 The site was allocated for housing in the adopted UDP and was a phase 2 allocation within the FDDP. This was changed to safeguarded land within the RDDP following the Council's assessment that it had a sufficiency of housing supply in light of RPG12 requirements. The site has never been part of the Green Belt. My conclusions regarding the overall supply of housing land allocations are set out in the Policy Framework volume of my report.
- 6.328 PPG2 requires that safeguarded land should be genuinely capable of development when needed and be located so as to promote sustainable development. The Council indicates that it has no evidence of a flooding problem on the site. A gas pipeline does not cross the site but runs along the line of the public footpath abutting the southern boundary. Subject to a suitable engineering solution to provide access from Weavers Hill I have no reason to doubt that the site could be genuinely capable of development in the future. Impact on residential amenity is a detailed development control matter and RDDP Policy D4 aims to ensure that crime prevention is considered as an integral part of any development. The public footpath skirting the southern boundary of the site could be protected in any development. The Council indicates that the field making up the bulk of the site is in private ownership with no public right of access across it and eventual development of the site would have no impact on protected habitats.
- 6.329 However, in locational terms Haworth is classified in the RDDP as a less well located settlement. It is not part of the urban area, where development should be concentrated in accordance with national, regional and local planning policy as set out in PPG3, RPG12 and the RDDP. I therefore consider the Council is correct in deleting the site's phase 2 allocation.
- 6.330 It will be important to ensure that there is scope for residential provision beyond the plan period to cater particularly for local housing requirements, whilst also ensuring that the long-term boundary of the Green Belt endures. This is one site that could potentially help to fulfil these objectives if it were to be designated as safeguarded land. The site is relatively well placed in respect of certain facilities and services within Haworth, and bus services. Within the Policy Framework volume of my report I have concluded that there is a paucity of designated safeguarded land within the district.
- 6.331 However, English Heritage in particular is concerned about the possible impact of development on the Haworth Conservation Area. Only the small north-eastern portion of the objection site falls within the present conservation area boundary. This may be excluded together with the recent residential development at Weavers Hill following the Council's re-assessment of the conservation area. Nevertheless, the setting of the conservation area and, because of Haworth's world-renown through the Brontë connection, the village as a whole, are very important considerations.
- 6.332 The designation as safeguarded land would mean that no development would be likely until beyond the life of the plan. Eventual development would, however, result in some encroachment into the landscape setting of this part of the village. There are panoramic views of the old village's hillside position from across the valley and the surrounding agricultural and moorland landscape provides a backdrop and setting for it. I accept that the drawing of the Green Belt boundary as the Council suggests would result in enduring protection for the rising land to the west. Nevertheless, eventual development on the objection site would spread some way up the hillside and would result in a consolidation of housing at Weavers Hill which, as the Council's own draft conservation area

assessment acknowledges, does not appear at ease as it protrudes into the Haworth landscape.

- 6.333 For many visitors to Haworth the journey into the large car park to the north of the site may be their first experience of the village. In my view, the open setting of fields up to the edge of the car park greatly contributes to the special interest, character and experience of the village. This would be lost in part by development on the site, irrespective of the form or quality of what could be built. I consider the prevention of further sprawl and encroachment into the countryside, and the protection of the setting of Haworth, are good reasons why the Green Belt boundary should be extended to include the field that makes up the bulk of the objection site. The redrawing of the Green Belt boundary along the access road to the car park and to the immediate western side of residential development at Weavers Hill would be clear and robust.
- 6.334 Exceptional circumstances have to exist if land is to be added to the Green Belt. I consider that these do exist, as I argue in the Policy Framework volume of this report.
- 6.335 It is therefore my overall view that this site is very important to the setting and character of Haworth and its conservation area. Development on it, even if delayed for a considerable time by reason of the site being designated as safeguarded land, would be likely to have a harmful impact on these. The open field that makes up the bulk of the site fulfils various purposes of the Green Belt. I consider that the importance of the site's continuing openness and its contribution to the character and setting of the village outweigh any need for the land to be safeguarded to provide for housing land in the longer term. I say this even bearing in mind my conclusions regarding the large-scale shortfall in safeguarded land generally within the district to meet development demands beyond the plan period. The field portion of the overall site should therefore be designated as Green Belt. The balance of the site would then be below the plan's threshold for allocations and so should be unallocated.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.336 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site's safeguarded land designation K/UR5.34 and the designation of that part of the site to the west of Weavers Hill and the access road to the car park as Green Belt.**

**K/H2.36, SOM/K/E4/79, SOM/K/BH7/79 & SOM/K/OS6/79: Ivy Bank Lane, Haworth, Keighley**

## **Objectors**

24/11253	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs W Gratton</i>
946/892	<i>Ms J D Rolston</i>
1459/10798	<i>English Heritage</i>
1742/3225 & 5948	<i>Haworth Parish Council</i>
2120/2153	<i>Mrs S Palmer</i>
2123/2151	<i>Mr Ian Palmer</i>
3123/3277 & 5944	<i>Mr Keith C Wilson</i>
3814/6546	<i>Mrs M E Hamer</i>
4354/9897	<i>Miss Elizabeth Hamer</i>
4431/7495 & 7499	<i>Mr M R Percival</i>

## Summary of Objections

- Until the strain on local facilities is addressed there should be no more large-scale housing allocations.
- The principle of re-use of the mill building is supported but its use for employment should be considered before housing.
- Part of the site is being considered for a health centre and this may be a catalyst for improving accessibility to the mill and its attractiveness to other uses. It is therefore premature to allocate the site for housing.
- Access to the site is dangerous, there are local parking problems and development will add to congestion.
- The allotments should be returned to use, the area forming an important landscape and wildlife corridor.
- Any development would detract from the character of the village. The site should be kept open and undeveloped and included within the conservation area.
- If the land is allocated the justification to it should seek to ensure no loss of trees or walls that contribute to the character of the settlement, and that development will only be permitted where refurbishment of the mill is included.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.337 This triangular-shaped site comprises disused allotments and derelict mill buildings with associated land. It was allocated as a phase 2 housing site in the FDDP. This was changed to being unallocated in the RDDP on the basis of the Council's reassessment of housing figures following the publication of RPG12. About a third of the site is subject to a Council resolution to grant planning permission for the construction of a medical centre, subject to the conclusion of a section 106 obligation. The remainder of the site is dominated by the former Ivy Bank Mill complex of about 0.75 hectares in extent.

6.338 National, regional and RDDP policies point to new housing allocations being concentrated within the urban areas rather than in less well located settlements such as Haworth, which have only moderate public transport links. I have seen no compelling evidence to suggest that there is an overriding need for housing to satisfy local needs. Therefore it is my view that the Council's removal of the housing allocation from this site is correct.

6.339 The fact that the site does not have any specific allocation will mean that any proposals that come forward for development on the site will be judged against the range of relevant policies in the plan, including those relating to design and highway considerations. The Haworth Conservation Area has been re-appraised and it is proposed that it be extended to cover the objection land, presumably in recognition of the site's contribution to the appearance and character of this part of the village. The UDP itself is not the correct vehicle for making alterations to such areas but, if extended, this designation would mean that any development proposal would be judged within the context of whether it would preserve or enhance the area. It would be at the detailed planning stage that impact on trees, walls and the mill buildings themselves would be assessed. This would also be the case with the detailed highway and parking aspects of any scheme. Some form of positive development on the site would be more likely to assist the overall retention of the mill complex than the site's more passive allocation as allotments.

6.340 It is my overall view that no modification to the plan is necessary.



## Recommendation

**6.341 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.  
K/H2.37 AND K/H1.3: Hainsworth Road, Silsden (SOM/K/H1/21)**

## Objectors

4119/12574                      *Lattice Property Holdings Ltd*  
4191/12589                      *Countryside Strategic Projects PLC*

*The objectors to site allocation K/H1.3 are listed in the appendix to this report.*

## Summary of Objections

- See under 3.0 at the beginning of this volume.
- This site is washland and regularly floods.
- The land should be included in a mixed use area with the neighbouring employment allocation, or the boundaries of the 2 allocations should be treated flexibly.
- The site, or part of it, should be reinstated to phase 1.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.342 The general reasons for rejecting large-scale housing allocations in Silsden are given above (see 3.3 et seq). This extensive site is greenfield land which should not be allocated for housing.

6.343 Washland arguments against allocation do not add further justified objections. The land is not within the floodplain or washlands, according to the Council's expert evidence.

6.344 Objections relating to mixed use, and to a phase 1 housing allocation for a small part of the site, are considered above (SOM/UR7/380 and SOM/H1/21.01).

## Recommendation

**6.345 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of housing allocation K/H2.37.**

**SOM/K/H2/20: Station Road, Oxenhope (K/E1.22)**

## Objector

889/4504                      *The Perseverance Mill Partnership*

## Summary of Objection

- The site should be allocated for housing under Policy H2 instead of employment use.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.346 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.22 above. Whilst I conclude that allocation for employment use is inappropriate I also find that allocation for housing would be unacceptable in this location.

### **Recommendation**

6.347 **My recommendation is given under reference K/E1.22 above.**

**SOM/K/H2/77: Mill Lane, Oakworth (K/H2.28)**

### **Objectors**

2445/11001                      *Mrs Edna Furniss*  
2447/10998                      *Mr Roger M Furniss*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The mill and the adjacent site (site K/H2.28 in the FDPP and now K/UR5.30 in the RDDP) should be developed together in sympathy with the conservation area.
- Once unused the land is likely to deteriorate.
- Enlargement of the site would prevent it from becoming landlocked as both parcels of land would be accessed via Mill Lane.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.348 The site comprises the Grade II listed vacant and fire-damaged Oakworth Mills together with a range of terraced mill cottages and a section of Mill Lane. It is unallocated in the RDDP. To the south side of Mill Lane is land that was designated in the FDDP as a phase 2 housing site (K/H2.28). Within the RDDP the western portion of this latter site was changed to a safeguarded land designation (K/UR5.30), with the eastern portion being de-allocated. I have dealt with objections in respect of this land under K/H2.28.

6.349 The mill building already benefits from extant planning permission and listed building consent for redevelopment. It is not therefore dependent on the development of adjacent land to ensure its beneficial use or positive contribution to the conservation area within which it is situated. Furthermore, the site is below the 0.4 hectare threshold used in the RDDP for allocating land.

6.350 The objectors suggest that the mill and associated land should be developed together with the land to the south. However, neither they nor anyone else has objected to the change to the safeguarded land designation. If the mill site were to be allocated together with this other land this would imply that no development would be likely before the end of the plan period, jeopardising the possible re-use of these listed buildings. I do not consider that independent development of the mill complex would necessarily result in the landlocking of the safeguarded land to the south. The condition of land and any possible deterioration in it is not determinative of its land use allocation.

### **Recommendation**

6.351 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/H2/227: Lyon Road, Steeton with Eastburn (K/E1.1)**

**Objector**

3842/10098 *Taywood Homes Ltd*

**Summary of Objection**

- The site should be allocated for housing under Policy H2 of the RDDP instead of employment land.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.352 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.1 above, where I conclude that allocation for employment is not justified at this time but that housing is unacceptable in this location. Accordingly, I recommend that the site should be designated as safeguarded land in order to provide for possible long-term expansion of the adjacent employment use.

**Recommendation**

**6.353 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the employment allocation and its substitution by the safeguarded land designation under Policy UR5.**

**SOM/K/H2/239 & SOM/K/GB1/239: Land at Old Lodge Hill/Hardings Lane, Ilkley**

**Objector**

4182/10124 & 10125 *Diocese of Leeds*

**Summary of Objections**

- The site serves no Green Belt function and should be allocated for residential development.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.354 I disagree with the objector that the site fulfils no Green Belt purpose or function. On the contrary, continuing designation would prevent any extension to existing residential development to the south sprawling up the hillside and encroaching into an area of attractive countryside, which forms part of the wider setting for Ilkley. Removal of the site from the Green Belt would weaken these important purposes. In addition to these the site is important to the attractive setting of the Grade 1 listed Myddleton Lodge. The Council indicates that this has been recognised by English Heritage in its designation of the whole field as a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

6.355 PPG2 advises that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered if justified by exceptional circumstances. The fact that the land would be available for residential development in what is a popular and highly sought after area does not, in my view, amount to such an exceptional circumstance. This is especially so in relation to what is a peripheral greenfield site that does not have any particular sustainable characteristics and whose allocation would not accord well with advice in PPG3. I do not consider there are any reasons to differ from the conclusions of the Inspectors who considered objections to earlier plans. They both reaffirmed the functions of the Green Belt in this area as well as considering the site to form an integral part of the setting of Myddleton Lodge.

### **Recommendation**

6.356 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## Chapter 7 Centres

### PARAGRAPH 7.0: Ilkley Town Centre

#### Objectors

3473/10949	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs Cockshott</i>
3651/10947	<i>Ilkley Design Statement Group</i>
3858/10948	<i>Ilkley Civic Society</i>

#### Summary of Objections

- There is a need to emphasise natural beauty and sustainability, and this may mean constraints on tourism and shop development.
- There is a need to manage traffic and parking, and to integrate train and bus schedules.
- The opportunity should be taken to re-focus Ilkley town centre, strengthening support for pedestrian safety policies, the local transport plan, town centre housing, bandstand, paving and street furniture, planting and improved public transport.
- The Council's intention "to undertake a programme of measures on roads, pavements and surrounding public areas to improve pedestrian safety and create environmental improvements in the centre" needs to go out to consultation, and should form part of a Town Centre Management Plan.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.1 Whilst there are a number of concerns raised by these objections, they relate largely to the conflicts between maintaining and improving the attractiveness of the town centre as a place to live in and visit, and the pressures created by people coming into the town centre for work, tourism, leisure or shopping.
- 7.2 These are clearly important issues but many cannot be addressed by the land use policies of a UDP. Ilkley will continue to be an attractive place to live in and visit, and the compact form of the town, and the conservation area, provide limited scope for change. The RDDP does not therefore envisage any major new development, with only two small areas identified for town centre expansion, and these are considered later in this report.
- 7.3 In parallel with the preparation of the Replacement UDP, an Ilkley Town Centre Study has been undertaken with full public consultation. This identifies a programme of measures, some of which have been approved by the Council, and will receive funding through the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan. These include improved pedestrian accessibility, traffic management, improved facilities at bus stops and Ilkley bus/rail station, and environmental improvements, which should go some way towards addressing the concerns expressed. However, provision of public transport is outside the control of the Council, and it would be inappropriate to include reference to this in the RDDP.
- 7.4 The issue of car parking is also being addressed through the Ilkley Town Centre Study, and the Council is reviewing on-street waiting restrictions with a view to reducing long stay parking, and introducing permit parking schemes. In addition, the RDDP includes policies to maintain the existing level of car parking provision. Neither this policy nor the town centre policies of the RDDP would preclude redevelopment of existing car parks,

(and specific mention has been made by objectors of the central car park) but policies would ensure that replacement car parking was provided.

### **Recommendation**

**7.5 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/CT1/83: Keighley Town Centre Expansion Area (Damside)**

### **Objector**

4313/5649 *Asda Stores Limited*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The Expansion Area should be deleted.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.6 The basis of this objection is not that the Expansion Area is unsuitable for town centre uses, but that it would not accommodate a large foodstore. The Council has accepted that, if a need was established for this form of development, it could not be accommodated on this site.

7.7 This area is on the opposite side of a main road from the town centre, but within easy walking distance of the Primary Shopping Area and bus station. It is occupied by a former petrol filling station and multi-storey car park, and site clearance and redevelopment could be costly. However, I see no reason in principle why this site should not be used for town centre uses, such as comparison retailing or leisure.

### **Recommendation**

**7.8 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/CT1/84: Keighley Town Centre Expansion Area (Water Lane)**

### **Objector**

4313/5648 *Asda Stores Limited*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The Expansion Area should be deleted.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.9 The basis of this objection is not that the Expansion Area is unsuitable for town centre uses, but that it would not accommodate a large foodstore. The Council has accepted that, if a need was established for this form of development, it could not be accommodated on this site.

7.10 This area immediately adjoins the defined town centre, and is within easy walking distance of the Primary Shopping Area and bus station. Access is poor, and there are clearly difficulties with site conditions, but it is in a very good location for town centre uses that would not create significant traffic movements.

### **Recommendation**

7.11 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/CT1/85: Keighley Town Centre Expansion Area (Alkincote Street)**

#### **Objector**

4313/5647 *Asda Stores Limited*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The Expansion Area should be deleted.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.12 The basis of this objection is not that the Expansion Area is unsuitable for town centre uses, but that it would not accommodate a large foodstore. At the time of the Inquiry, the site was being developed in association with the adjoining Morrisons foodstore, and hence with the type of use envisaged in the allocation. In view of the fact that the development will have been completed before the plan is adopted, it would seem logical to delete this as an Expansion Area and include the site within the defined town centre boundary.

### **Recommendation**

7.13 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the Town Centre Expansion Area at Alkincote Street, Keighley and inclusion of the land within the defined Keighley Town Centre boundary.**

### **SOM/K/CT1/86: Keighley Town Centre Expansion Area (Worth Way West)**

#### **Objector**

4313/5646 *Asda Stores Limited*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The Expansion Area should be deleted.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.14 The basis of this objection is not that the Expansion Area is unsuitable for town centre uses, but that it would not accommodate a large foodstore. The Council has accepted that,

if a need was established for this form of development, it could not be accommodated on this site.

- 7.15 This is the largest of the Expansion Areas. It adjoins the town centre boundary along part of one frontage, and is within easy walking distance of the Primary Shopping Area and bus station. It is almost totally developed with a variety of uses including retail, leisure, car showrooms and employment uses. Whilst some of the buildings may be nearing the end of their useful life, others are relatively new, and there are a large number of different ownerships. It is therefore unlikely that large-scale redevelopment would occur here but the site is well located for a range of town centre uses, either utilising existing buildings or through redevelopment of one or more properties.

### **Recommendation**

- 7.16 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/CT1/87: Keighley Town Centre Secondary Expansion Area (East of River)**

#### **Objector**

4313/5645 *Asda Stores Limited*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The Expansion Area should be deleted.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 7.17 The basis of this objection is not that the Expansion Area is unsuitable for town centre uses, but that it would not accommodate a large foodstore. The Council has accepted that, if a need was established for this form of development, it could not be accommodated on this site.
- 7.18 This area is intended to accommodate needs that cannot be met in the town centre or the other Expansion Areas. It is separated from the town centre by the Worth Way West Expansion Area, the line of the proposed Worth Way/East Parade link and the River Worth. It is, however, contained within the loop of the railway and offers some potential for town centre uses in the longer term.

### **Recommendation**

- 7.19 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/CT1/88: Ilkley Town Centre Expansion Area (Leeds Road)**

#### **Objectors**

3505/7287 *Mr & Mrs J D Cartwright*  
3636/6722 *Mrs Barbara J Cussons*  
3651/7662 *Ilkley Design Statement Group*



3694/8954                      *Wharfedale District Scout Council*  
3858/10994                    *Ilkley Civic Society*

### **Summary of Objections**

- Question the need for additional shopping areas.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.20 The Retail Capacity Study produced in 1999 by Colliers Erdman Lewis, on behalf of West Yorkshire Planning Forum, identified a quantitative need for both convenience and comparison floorspace in Ilkley in the period up to 2011. This study was updated by the Council in 2000 and 2001, and the situation remains unchanged.

7.21 It is clear from visiting the town centre that it is in good health with very few vacant properties, the exception being the Station Plaza complex, which has a number of vacant units despite its location within the Primary Shopping Area. There are quite a number of charity shops, and the emphasis of the town centre has no doubt changed as a result of the introduction of large foodstores on the edge of the town centre. However, I see no reason to doubt the findings of the retail capacity studies. I accept the principle of the Council's view that it would be advisable to make provision for expansion of the town centre, should it be required.

7.22 This site is occupied by the former All Saints Primary School and a car park. The school is currently being converted into residential accommodation, and hence the only area which is likely to be available for development is the car park, and this would need to be retained or replaced under the provisions of Policy TM14. Also, this part of the site is separated from the town centre by the busy Leeds Road, and the school building. In these circumstances, I consider that the site is unsuitable for town centre expansion.

### **Recommendation**

7.23 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the Town Centre Expansion Area at Leeds Road, Ilkley.**

**SOM/K/CT1/89:      Ilkley Town Centre Expansion Area (Wellington Road)**

### **Objectors**

3505/5643 & 7288      *Mr & Mrs J D Cartwright*  
3636/6718              *Mrs Barbara J Cussons*  
3651/7663              *Ilkley Design Statement Group*  
3694/8955              *Wharfedale District Scout Council*

### **Summary of Objections**

- Question the need for additional shopping areas.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 7.24 As indicated above, I accept that there could be a need for additional retail floorspace in Ilkley, and that it may not be possible to accommodate this within the existing town centre boundary.
- 7.25 This site adjoins the Booths foodstore, and is currently in use as a builders' merchants. From the representations at the Inquiry, it is clear that this is well used and much appreciated by local residents, and complements the retail offer within the town centre. However, it would also be suitable for other retail or leisure uses in view of its location adjoining a large foodstore with good access from the main road. In these circumstances, I consider that this site should provide for town centre expansion.

### **Recommendation**

- 7.26 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/CT1/105 & SOM/K/E6/105: Peter Black's, Bradford Road, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

4313/5600 & 5601 *Asda Stores Limited*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be removed from the Employment Zone and allocated for town centre expansion.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 7.27 The request for this land to be designated as an Expansion Area is based on a contention that there is a need for a significant amount of additional convenience floorspace and this could not be accommodated on any of the Expansion Areas proposed in the plan.

#### *Retail Need*

- 7.28 The Colliers Erdman Lewis (CEL) Retail Capacity Study identified scope for significant additional comparison goods floorspace in Keighley for the period up to 2011, but only limited scope for convenience floorspace. The latter has already been taken up by increased floorspace in the two existing large foodstores and other convenience outlets. This assessment was based on growth in expenditure only, taking a conservative approach to such growth, and did not consider the adequacy of the existing provision. However, it recognised that there may be strong planning, social and economic reasons for permitting development in excess of the levels set out in the report, where there are local deficiencies and potential to claw back expenditure.
- 7.29 Whilst the CEL Study provides a useful overview of shopping patterns within West Yorkshire, it is of limited use in assessing individual centres. Surveys undertaken by Asda in connection with a specific proposal for a foodstore on the objection site look in more detail at the relationship between the expenditure generated within the Keighley catchment and the extent to which this is provided for by the existing convenience stores.

---

It is clear from these surveys that the expenditure generated significantly exceeds the estimated turnover of the existing foodstores, based on company averages. Thus, there is capacity for additional convenience floorspace within the Keighley catchment. However, this does not directly equate to need as it will partly be absorbed by stores trading at above company average levels, which is not necessarily unacceptable. Morrisons in Keighley was very busy on the various occasions that I visited the store during the course of the Inquiry but, when I visited it again after the completion of the alterations and extensions, there appeared to be considerably less congestion in the store, although the car park was busy. I do not doubt that Morrisons is trading well above the company average, whilst Sainsburys had less customers, although it was by no means deserted.

- 7.30 Some expenditure will inevitably leak to stores outside the catchment area as other centres or stores may be equally, or more, accessible, or shoppers may be visiting other locations for purposes such as work and will carry out their shopping on a combined trip. Also, Bingley is within the same catchment, and Keighley currently draws more trade from the zones closest to Bingley than does Bingley town centre. This is a situation which the plan aims to redress, with a proposal for a larger foodstore to replace the existing Safeway store in Bingley, and I agree with the Council that this is necessary if the town is to be restored to its rightful place in the hierarchy.
- 7.31 The figures on capacity, and the trading levels at Morrisons, suggest to me that there is a need for some additional convenience floorspace within the Keighley catchment area. However, given the late introduction and incomplete nature of the need evidence, it would not be appropriate to attempt to reach a conclusion on the extent of need or whether it should be accommodated within or adjacent to Keighley town centre, or elsewhere within the catchment area.

#### *The Sequential Approach to Site Selection*

- 7.32 This site is separated from the town centre, and the Central Shopping Area, by the railway. There was some discussion at the Inquiry as to the distance between this site, and the defined Expansion Areas, from the Primary Shopping Area and the bus station. The retail policies of the RDDP allow for development within the Central Shopping Areas or, failing that, within the defined boundaries of the town centres or in the Expansion Areas. Policy CR7 and the supporting text indicate that, where there is a need for a development, and no sites are available in, or adjacent to, these shopping areas, sites which are nearest to the centre and which have highest accessibility by public transport will be favoured over those which are more remote. I have recommended a number of changes to the retail policies and the explanatory text to more closely reflect Government guidance in PPG6. These include a recommendation that the replacement for Policies CR7 and CR11 should clearly set out the sequential approach with the first preference being sites within centres, followed by sites on the edge of the City or town centres.
- 7.33 In my view this is an edge-of-centre site. The distance from the Primary Shopping Area to the edge of the site is less than 200m and, although the entrance to any new store would be beyond this, I accept that a development could be designed to provide for an easily accessible pedestrian entrance. The railway crossing creates a perceived barrier, but I do not consider that it is so great as to deter pedestrian movement between the site and the town centre. Whilst the bus station is probably further than customers would choose to carry heavy bags of shopping, there are bus stops located much closer. Also, the Council accepts there is no sequentially preferable site, if a need exists for a large foodstore.

### *Conclusion on Retail Issues*

7.34 It would therefore appear that, if a need exists for additional retail floorspace of a type that could not be accommodated on the sites currently identified as Expansion Areas, this site would be well suited. However, I am not satisfied that a need has been demonstrated for this scale of development, and consider that this should be examined in more detail in the context of a specific proposal.

### *Employment Considerations*

7.35 This site is part of an extensive employment area, the majority of which is to the east of Bradford Road. It was indicated at the Inquiry that the site was unsuitable for continued use by the present occupier, and I appreciate that it does have some limitations. However, I do not consider that these would preclude some form of employment use.

7.36 I note that areas have been taken out of the Employment Zones in the adopted UDP, and in the case of Worth Way this is to allow for town centre expansion. If I had concluded that this site was required for town centre expansion, then this would have been weighed against the need for employment sites. However, in the light of my conclusion on retail issues, I see no basis for taking this site out of the Employment Zone.

### **Recommendation**

7.37 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/CR7/71: Keighley Road (North), Silsden (K/E1.6)**

#### **Objector**

4151/6027 *Laxton Crawford Limited*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The site should be available for non-food retailing and showroom uses.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.38 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.6 above, where I conclude that the site is appropriately allocated for employment and is too remote from the main retail centre of Silsden to support or complement it. The site is not restricted to core employment activities and thus some showroom and leisure uses would be acceptable.

### **Recommendation**

7.39 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/CR7/74 & SOM/K/CL3/74: Land at Hard Ings Road/Alston Road, Keighley (SOM/K/E6/74)**

### **Objector**

4142/5992 & 5995     *Mr M Whiteley/Keighley Abattoir/Ondura Limited*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be removed from the Employment Zone, and allocated for non-food retail/showroom/fast food/leisure.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 7.40 This site is currently partly in employment use, and partly vacant, following the demolition of buildings. To the east is Alston Retail Park, to the north are employment uses, to the west an ambulance station, and to the south a park. The site is some distance from Keighley town centre.
- 7.41 The policies of the plan, in line with Government advice, seek to support and safeguard town centres by concentrating retail and leisure uses within the town centre, or in the designated Expansion Areas. Any development outside of these areas would have to show that there was a need for the development, and that there were no sequentially preferable sites.
- 7.42 The retail study carried out by Colliers Erdman Lewis in 1999 indicated that there was little need for further convenience floorspace, but that there was likely to be capacity for some 13,321 sq m of additional comparison floorspace by 2011. Some further development has taken place since that time, and the Council considers that the Expansion Areas will provide for any additional need. The objectors point out that one of the Expansion Areas is currently being developed as an extension to the adjoining foodstore, and suggest that the other areas would not satisfy the need for non-food retail floorspace because of size, ownership or physical constraints. I consider specific objections to these allocations earlier in this report, and accept that they may not be suited to the provision of large retail units. However, I see no reason why they should not accommodate small-scale uses, either through the re-use or redevelopment of existing buildings.
- 7.43 Whilst the objectors indicate that there is demand for a certain size of unit, they provide no specific evidence to show that the need could not be accommodated within the town centre, the Expansion Areas, or other sequentially preferable locations. Neither has any evidence been submitted to indicate that there is a need for leisure development that cannot be met within the town centre or Expansion Areas. In these circumstances, it would be inappropriate to allocate this site for retail or leisure development.
- 7.44 This site falls within the Employment Zone to the north of Keighley, which is an established employment area, well located to serve the needs of the town. The objectors do not suggest that the site is unsuitable for continued use for employment purposes, and I see no reason to remove it from the Employment Zone.

## **Recommendation**

**7.45 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/CR7/90: Silsden Local Centre (Hainsworth Street)**

### **Objectors**

3839/7991	<i>Bryant Homes Northern Ltd</i>
3899/5642	<i>Mrs Janet Burgoyne</i>
4137/5640	<i>Yorkshire Co-operatives Properties Ltd</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The Expansion Area should be deleted.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 7.46 Although all of the objections are requesting the deletion of the Expansion Area, there are different reasons. One objection is that there is no need for additional retail development, one that the Sykes Lane site is preferable, and two refer to traffic problems at the junction of Clog Bridge and Elliott Street with Kirkgate.
- 7.47 The shopping provision in Silsden comprises a Co-op store to the north of the centre, together with an extensive range of smaller shops and services. The Co-op store was extended following a planning permission granted in 1996, and appears to be a reasonable size to cater for the day-to-day convenience shopping needs of the residents of Silsden. The plan indicates that further food shopping facilities are likely to be required to cater for the needs arising from the large amount of new housing proposed.
- 7.48 In the absence of any major new development, the need for additional retail floorspace will be significantly less. However, there is little scope within the defined local centre to improve the shopping provision for the existing residents of Silsden, and I think it reasonable to allow for some expansion. This site is well located, being only some 35 metres from the boundary of the local centre, and at the opposite end of the centre from the Co-op store. The plan suggests that the site would be suitable for a supermarket, which would increase the choice available to residents. In my view retail development here would complement the existing centre and, although there could be some loss of trade from the existing shops, there could also be a reduction in the amount of trade leaving Silsden for larger stores elsewhere.
- 7.49 Vehicular access to the site is somewhat difficult, but the plan indicates that any development here will need to ensure that additional vehicular and pedestrian movements can be accommodated safely and without detriment to the free flow of traffic at the unsatisfactory junction of Clog Bridge and Elliott Street with Kirkgate.
- 7.50 I consider the Sykes Lane site below, and conclude that it is not a suitable location for expansion of the local centre.

## **Recommendation**

**7.51 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/CR7/91 & SOM/K/UR7/91: Silsden Local Centre (Sykes Lane)**

#### **Objectors**

3946/5639 & 6104     *Mrs Patricia Norris*  
4137/5638            *Yorkshire Co-operatives Properties Ltd*  
4222/10992          *Mr Albert Muff*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The Expansion Area should be deleted.
- This should form part of a larger mixed use area.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.52 The shopping provision in Silsden comprises a Co-op store to the north of the centre, together with an extensive range of smaller shops and services. The Co-op store was extended following a planning permission granted in 1996, and appears to be a reasonable size to cater for the day-to-day convenience shopping needs of the residents of Silsden. The plan indicates that further food shopping facilities are likely to be required to cater for the needs arising from the large amount of new housing proposed. In the absence of any major new development, the need for additional retail floorspace will be significantly less. However, I consider that there could be limited scope for improvement to the retail provision in Silsden without detriment to existing retailers, as trade could be drawn back from larger stores and centres elsewhere.

7.53 This site is within the 200-300 metre distance from the centre, referred to in PPG6 as an easy walking distance. However, the canal effectively defines the southern edge of the centre and this, together with the existing buildings separating the site from Keighley Road, make the proposed Expansion Area appear remote from the centre. I do not therefore consider that this site is a suitable location for such a use.

7.54 I have considered the objection requesting a mixed use allocation earlier in this report in respect of SOM/K/UR7/380.

#### **Recommendation**

**7.55 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the Expansion Area at Sykes Lane, Silsden.**

**SOM/K/CR7/109 & SOM/K/CL3/109: Land at Leeds Road, Ben Rhydding, Ilkley  
(SOM/K/GB1/109 & SOM/K/E1/109)**

**Objectors**

3858/10936 *Ilkley Civic Society*  
4140/11813 & 5608 *Rignet Limited*

**Summary of Objections**

- There should be a planning brief for the disused garage, existing caravan storage and industrial units on this site.
- The site should be allocated for showroom, leisure, office, non-food retail or fast food.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.56 This is an isolated pocket of development in the Green Belt, remote from any settlement, comprising a disused petrol filling station, caravan sales and storage, and assorted other uses. The site has a somewhat untidy appearance but PPG2 advises that Green Belt boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict. In my view there are no exceptional circumstances for removing the land from the Green Belt, and development for retail, leisure or employment purposes would conflict with the policies of the RDDP and Government guidance.

7.57 I can understand the wish of some objectors to see an improvement in the appearance of the site, but it would be inconsistent with the aims of Green Belt policy for the RDDP to include encouragement for any form of development on the site other than in accordance with Policies GB1 and GB4.

**Recommendation**

7.58 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/CL3/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

**Objectors**

7/2089 *Mr Timothy John Laycock*  
22/2075 *Mr Lawrence Wilson*  
52/2077 *Mrs Aileen Firm*  
166/2074 *Mr & Mrs David & Hazel Carter*  
1272/2081 *Mr Robin Shepherd*  
1348/2085 *Mr Peter Sanderson*  
1350/2083 *Dr Sommerlad*  
1412/5235 *Mrs Patricia Rosalind Shepherd*  
2738/7780 *Ms Amy Rolston*  
1684/2080 *Ms Rachel Anne Lee*  
2438/2087 *Mr David Robertson-Brown*  
3119/7692 *Mr Eric Brown*  
3396/11812 *Mrs Sarah Jane Woodhouse*  
3437/7172 *Ms Tracey Rolston*  
4080/5270 *Mr Matthew Goulden*



4560/7478

*Ms Barbara Combe*

4561/7482

*Mr Timothy Clive Lucas*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be used for community use/leisure/arts/cultural/living museum/library/sports purposes.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.59 The site is no longer allocated for housing purposes within the RDDP. I have considered the site in relation to K/H2.34, above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

7.60 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than any approved amendment to the conservation area boundary being shown on the Proposals Map.**

**SOM/K/CL3/71: Keighley Road (North), Silsden (K/E1.6)**

### **Objector**

4151/6029

*Laxton Crawford Limited*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The development of leisure facilities should be permitted on the site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.61 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.6 and SOM/K/CR7/71 above, where I conclude that the site is appropriately allocated for employment. As the RDDP does not restrict the site to core employment activities, some leisure and tourism uses could be acceptable, subject to Policy CL3.

### **Recommendation**

7.62 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

### **K/TM6.1: Ilkley to Steeton Bus Link**

#### **Objectors**

3651/7656                      *Ilkley Design Statement Group*  
4191/11080                    *Countryside Strategic Projects PLC*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- It is suggested that a bus lane be provided on the A65 as it passes through Ilkley and this is neither desirable nor feasible.
- In due course it is presumed that the Bus Priority Network would need to follow the line of the Silsden bypass and a new link road to the south of the town and this could be used to require the construction of bus lanes. Such an approach would have a seriously detrimental effect upon the economics of the whole Silsden expansion scheme.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 8.1 The Bus Priority Network, in part, follows the A65 through Ilkley town centre. The RDDP indicates that bus priority measures will be introduced where there are unacceptable delays to buses causing disruption to timetables and affecting service reliability, or where the free movement through key junctions is impeded by congestion. The provision of bus lanes is only one of the measures that might be undertaken. In my view it does not follow that designation as a part of the Bus Priority Network would necessarily mean that bus lanes would be provided, this being a matter for detailed design consideration in the light of specific problems that might be encountered. The objector, the Ilkley Design Statement Group, provides no justification for the view that should bus lanes be provided these would be neither desirable nor feasible. I see no reason for the notation of the Bus Priority Network passing through Ilkley to be modified on the basis of this objection.
- 8.2 Having regard to the concern expressed by Countryside Strategic Projects PLC about bus priority measures on the Silsden bypass, I have recommended elsewhere in this volume that neither proposals for the bypass nor large-scale residential allocations in the town be included within the plan. I therefore make no further comment on this particular objection to the policy.

#### **Recommendation**

- 8.3 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/TM6/80: Extension to Ilkley to Steeton Bus Link (K/TM6.1)**

#### **Objectors**

3651/7661                      *Ilkley Design Statement Group*  
3694/8956                      *Mr G Peacock*  
3858/5942                      *Ilkley Civic Society*

## Summary of Objections

- The Ilkley to Steeton bus link should not terminate within the centre of Steeton but should extend to Airedale Hospital.
- There should be an extension of a through service from the hospital back to Ilkley.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.4 The RDDP shows the line of the Bus Priority Network extending from central Ilkley to the junction of the A6034 and the A629 south of Silsden. The plan is a land use plan in respect of which the detailed provision of individual public transport services is not relevant. Policy TM6 seeks to ensure physical improvements to routes to give priority to buses and prevent unacceptable delays that cause disruption to timetables and affect service reliability. It also aims to take account of the physical consequences of possible development along public transport routes so that services and their use are not disadvantaged as a result of this.
- 8.5 Extending the notation of the Bus Priority Network into Steeton to Airedale Hospital on the Proposals Map would not in itself lead to the additional or extended services that the objectors wish to see. The provision of such services is the responsibility of Metro (the West Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive) and local bus operators. I do not consider that the nature and capacity of the relatively short stretch of road from the A629 to the hospital, or the level of likely development within Steeton, are such that there would be a necessity to extend the notation in order to facilitate any future provision.

## Recommendation

- 8.6 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### SOM/K/TM7.4: Ben Rhydding Station

#### Objectors

753/3339	<i>Mr Jolyon West</i>
5039/3342	<i>Wharfedale District Scout Council</i>
3561/3734	<i>Mr A J MacPherson</i>
3699/3340	<i>Wharfedale Division Guide Association</i>
3858/3666	<i>Ilkley Civic Society</i>
4696/5634	<i>David &amp; Helen Kidman</i>
4695/10938	<i>1st Ben Rhydding Scout Group</i>

## Summary of Objections

- The proposal would be inappropriate development which would harm the distinctive identity of the countryside, the attractive entrance to the main village, and the amenity of the Green Belt.
- It would result in the removal of the Scout and Guide headquarters and associated training ground and an alternative allocation for these should be made within the plan.
- An alternative allocation for Park and Ride should be made on what is a partially developed site adjacent to the station.

- A further alternative to the creation of additional car parking would be the provision of early morning and evening bus services from the suburbs and villages to co-ordinate with the rail timetable at both Ben Rhydding and Ilkley stations.
- The proposal would result in an undesirable increase in traffic and parking on Wheatley Lane with potential for increased accidents.
- There is concern over possible increases of litter and graffiti, and worsening of drainage problems in Wheatley Lane.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 8.7 Ben Rhydding station is defined within the RDDP as a location where the existing Park and Ride car park will be safeguarded, and extended where possible. Policy K/TM7.4 indicates that several options are being considered to provide additional parking here. There is no specific land allocation for such a Park and Ride facility although on the Proposals Map an indicative 'P' notation straddles land to the east side of Wheatley Lane. It is clearly in respect of this land that most objectors have directed their comments. The southern portion comprises the site of an existing Scout and Guide headquarters and associated open land used for training, amounting to about 0.5 hectares. The larger northerly element is a roughly triangular open grassed field bounded by the Scout headquarters to the south, and dry stone walls, hedging and post and rail fencing to its remaining sides.
- 8.8 The proposal is essentially a carry forward from the adopted UDP. However, in the Inspector's Report relating to objections to that plan it was indicated that the proposal would not mean the loss of the scouting facilities and the notation on the adopted UDP Proposals Map did not extend over its land; the notation was placed in the field immediately to the north, which is within the Green Belt. As previously, the Council anticipates that in the first instance any additional car park would be restricted to some 0.5 hectares, providing a capacity of about 100 vehicles. Further expansion of any Park and Ride facility might be considered on the basis of use and demand. The existing parking provision at the station is only some 18 to 20 spaces. However, it has now been suggested that the land for this initial phase might be that occupied by the Scout headquarters. Clarification of whether or not it is now contemplated that this land would be required is particularly relevant to the Scouting and Guiding objectors; their existing headquarters is approaching the end of its useful life and a replacement is needed within the next few years. In this regard reference should also be made to my conclusions on objections to SOM/K/CF3/323.03 and SOM/GB1/323.03.
- 8.9 Key aims of PPG13 are to promote more sustainable transport choices and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. The PPG points out that Park and Ride schemes can help to promote more sustainable travel patterns both at local and strategic levels. RPG12 recognises that the provision of Park and Ride facilities at railway stations is a way of making public transport more attractive. It also advises of the need for maintaining consistency between local transport plans and development plans.
- 8.10 The West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan includes provision for Park and Ride at Ben Rhydding. Such a facility would involve the use of vehicles for some part of individual journeys and it may, as claimed by some objectors, attract further car journeys from Ilkley. However, I consider it likely that it would contribute to the making of shorter car journeys and a reduction of overall car use throughout the district because people would use the train for part of their journey, which they may otherwise have completed by car.

The continued intent to provide for such a facility would accord with the thrust of both national and regional policy aimed at promoting sustainable development.

- 8.11 Changes in national and regional policy since the adoption of the existing UDP in my view strengthen the case for the provision of Park and Ride facilities. I have seen nothing that would detract from the Inspector's comments made in respect of this proposal in the context of the existing plan where the use of Green Belt land was contemplated. PPG2 (as inserted by PPG13) indicates that because of the Government's commitment to maintaining the openness of the Green Belt, when seeking to locate Park and Ride developments non-Green Belt alternatives should be investigated first. The Council has considered the alternative of provision on the former coal yard immediately to the west of the station where limited residential development is currently taking place. This has been discounted as it would be of inadequate size. I accept that this site would not be sufficiently large to cater for either the proposed initial provision or, more particularly, any expansion that was thereafter considered necessary. Other than this the objection site is the nearest available land for this facility.
- 8.12 Having regard to further PPG2 advice on Park and Ride schemes in the Green Belt I have seen or heard nothing to contradict the Inspector's conclusions on objections to the now adopted UDP in respect of the absence of alternatives in other settlements. I consider the proposal would represent the most sustainable option available. The open field is prominent from the A65 and from Wheatley Lane. However, I do not believe the scheme would be likely to seriously compromise the purpose of including the land in the Green Belt; it would be adjacent to existing development, would not involve any new buildings, would be capable of being screened, and would be likely to retain the fundamental openness of the site.
- 8.13 The field would be of sufficient size to accommodate a first phase of provision together with later expansion should this prove necessary. I have seen no substantive evidence to indicate why, in terms of foreseeable likely scale of parking provision, any of the Scout headquarters land would be needed, other than the possible provision of pedestrian access to the station.
- 8.14 The Council has indicated that Wheatley Lane operates within its capacity and that the additional traffic that would result from the scheme, even if concentrated at peak morning and evening periods, would not cause this to be exceeded. Traffic management measures have been introduced and I have no reason to believe that highway or pedestrian safety could not be assured through careful design. This might include the possibility of provision of a pedestrian footbridge from the site to the station.
- 8.15 The provision of feeder bus services to the station is not a land use issue, although this might be a laudable objective in principle to complement the Park and Ride facility. The Council indicates that the detailed planning of the Park and Ride scheme would examine the provision of facilities for bus services, such as shelters and turning areas.
- 8.16 I am satisfied that site-specific concerns such as water runoff and control over vandalism and litter are matters that could be overcome or minimised through careful design.
- 8.17 Overall, it is my view that the proposal's promotion of sustainability by encouraging travellers to use rail transport amounts to a sufficiently strong special circumstance to outweigh any harm to the Green Belt, which could be minimised through careful design and landscaping.

8.18 PPG1 indicates that development plans should aim to give a measure of certainty. At present it is clear to me that as far as the potential use of the Scout headquarters and its associated land is concerned such certainty is absent because of the Proposals Map notation. I acknowledge that as it stands this could result in difficulties in planning for a renewed or re-located facility for the local Scouting and Guiding authorities. There is no certainty that an extended Park and Ride scheme would come to fruition. Nevertheless, I consider that a further element of certainty could be provided by adding wording to Policy K/TM7.4 to indicate that the Scout headquarters and its associated land would not be required for the provision of car parking. The indicative 'P' on the Proposals Map should be moved so that it is wholly contained within the field immediately to the north.

### **Recommendation**

8.19 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by:**

- a) **The movement of the Park and Ride 'P' symbol on the Proposals Map so that it is wholly contained within the field to the east of Wheatley Lane, to the north of the Scout headquarters;**
- b) **The changing of the text accompanying K/TM7.4 to refer to the fact that the Scout headquarters land would not be required for parking in connection with Park and Ride expansion.**

**SOM/K/TM7/354: Ben Rhydding Station, Ilkley**

### **Objector**

3561/10375

*Mr A J MacPherson*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The proposal would be inappropriate development which would harm the distinctive identity of the countryside, the attractive entrance to the main village, and the amenity of the Green Belt.
- The proposed allocation should be deleted and a new allocation made to the west of Wheatley Lane on partially developed land adjacent to the station.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

8.20 My views on this objection are covered by my reasoning and conclusions in respect of K/TM7.4 above.

### **Recommendation**

8.21 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/TM8/379: Junction of A629 and A6034, Steeton with Eastburn**

### **Objector**

3374/10926

*Mrs M Hurrell*

### **Summary of Objection**

- Access needs to be built under or over the Aire Valley bypass (A629) for pedestrians wishing to reach the railway station from Silsden as the present crossing is inadequate and dangerous.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

8.22 I discuss above the problems experienced by pedestrians crossing the A629 at this point, but I have insufficient evidence to conclude or recommend on possible solutions. There is no evidence as to the seriousness of the problem, relative to other traffic problems in the District, and as to advisable solutions. The Council will be in a position to consider these matters when the A629 is de-trunked.

### **Recommendation**

8.23 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **K/TM20.1: Silsden Eastern Bypass, Silsden**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- There is no need for a bypass.
- A complete bypass is needed. The RDDP proposal would not function as a bypass.
- A bypass would increase flooding, noise and traffic fumes, and would cause harm to wildlife, the landscape, and Brunthwaite Conservation Area.
- The village of Silsden would be divorced from its surrounding countryside.
- The bypass would not be built, as a whole or in part, and is not viable.
- It would cause traffic chaos in Silsden and be dangerous in itself.
- The road would be at bedroom level as it passes near to houses on Lowfield Crescent.
- A high level bridge would be needed to cross the Leeds-Liverpool Canal Conservation Area.
- The line of the bypass should be amended on the Proposals Map and co-ordinated with an earlier release of housing allocations.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

8.24 I have recommended the deletion of all of the RDDP housing allocations and some employment allocations. The bypass is included in the plan only because of the allocations. With far fewer allocations the case for the bypass falls and developer funding is lost. The Council alone would not be able to fund the road, in view of the higher

priority of traffic problems in other parts of the District. Consequently I conclude that the bypass is not needed.

- 8.25 Without the development it is meant to serve, the bypass would appear as a scar on the landscape around Silsden. It could be well-designed, but, as the Council's landscape witness suggested, it would not be promoted for the sake of its landscape effects. As part of the overall development package, it would contribute to the loss of reasonably attractive open countryside. With or without the development, it would separate the settlement from surrounding hamlets and countryside. Its proximity to the conservation area at Brunthwaite would be likely in my opinion to harm the character of the conservation area, and the character and appearance of its setting. No design evidence is provided to show how the road's proximity to Brunthwaite would be handled in order to avoid harm.
- 8.26 The same consideration applies to the road's necessary rise from the low point in the Aire Valley, up to the higher land north of the Leeds-Liverpool canal. The Council acknowledges that the visual and noise impact of the canal crossing is a genuine concern. The views along the canal, and from the canal conservation area to the floodplain, are sensitive. In the absence of details of bridges and embankments, it seems to me that the effects would be harmful.
- 8.27 The likelihood is that the bypass would be carried on embankment past the houses on Lowfield Crescent. Adequate separation to maintain privacy could probably be achieved by increasing the distance between the road and the houses, as suggested in amended plans put in by an objector. Once again however the evidence does not show whether noise effects could satisfactorily be dealt with, without causing further visual harm through the erection of noise barriers.
- 8.28 Other harm from the bypass could be mitigated or prevented. A suggested minor relocation of part of the road could avoid the River Aire washlands. The removal of traffic in the centre of Silsden would result from the new road, and this would have the net effect of reducing traffic noise and fumes there. Existing housing would be shielded from traffic noise by new development, noise attenuation measures, differences in levels, and distance in many cases. There is no reason why the bypass should be dangerous. I comment above on the question of viability. The suggested alternative route across moorland further east is not suitable: amongst other things, it would cross land subject to international wildlife designations.
- 8.29 Overall, as there is no need for the bypass, I conclude that the proposal should be removed from the plan. The bypass line lies in the open countryside outside Silsden, and, in accordance with other recommendations of this report, should be included in the Green Belt.

## **Recommendation**

- 8.30 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Silsden Eastern bypass, and the inclusion of the bypass allocation within the Green Belt.**



## **K/TM20.3: Elliot Street/Keighley Road Junction, Silsden**

### **Objectors**

3923/12108                      *Mr Maurice Jackson Snr*  
4066/12566                      *Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The Elliot Street/Clog Bridge junction is below modern highway standards and improvements should be carried out forthwith. These should not be dependent on the provision of a bypass.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 8.31 The Council indicates that the Elliot Street junction with the A6034 Keighley Road/Kirkgate, passing through the centre of Silsden, is the busiest junction in the town. Visibility at the junction is, in particular, constrained by the humped-back bridge crossing of the main road over the canal some 40 metres to the south. Although the accident record at the junction is not in itself a major source of concern the Council acknowledges that the junction layout and restricted visibility are sources of anxiety to both pedestrians and drivers in the area.
- 8.32 Policy K/TM20.3 protects land for a highway improvement scheme at the junction. There is no indication given of timing or means of implementation. However, it is the Council's position, set out in its Inquiry evidence, that the present status of the A6034, as a significant and relatively isolated route between the A65 and A59 and the A629 and A650, makes a suitable treatment difficult. If a bypass was built the resulting reduced status of the route through the town centre would mean that a suitable junction treatment could be more readily achieved.
- 8.33 I have set out above my conclusions on the role of Silsden and I have recommended that the proposal for a bypass be deleted. If this recommendation is accepted then much of the current flow of traffic through Silsden will remain. This will probably be the case until the A56 Village Bypass scheme, promoted jointly by Lancashire and North Yorkshire County Councils in their respective Local Transport Plans, supersedes the A6068/A6034 as the major inter-county route linking the M65 and A65.
- 8.34 Studies carried out on behalf of one of the objectors following the adoption of the present UDP indicate that the signalling of the Elliot Street/Clog Bridge/Keighley Road junction, whilst not improving capacity, could improve safety for both pedestrians and vehicle users. The Council would have to assess whether the traffic importance of the A6034 outweighs the need for the improvement, bearing in mind the overall results of my recommendations, if adopted.
- 8.35 Although an indication of timing of any improvements may be helpful I note that no other schemes listed within the RDDP make mention of timing (except those larger-scale schemes which are cross-referred to the Local Transport Plan). I do not consider an exception needs to be made in this case.
- 8.36 Improvements are shown on the RDDP Proposals Map Changes but include only Elliot Street and Keighley Road/Kirkgate. It would seem prudent that as Clog Bridge is a

component of this staggered junction this should also be shown diagrammatically on the Proposals Map.

### **Recommendation**

**8.37 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by extending to Clog Bridge the notation on the Proposals Map relating to highway improvements at Elliot Street and Keighley Road, Silsden.**

**SOM/K/TM20/22: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (K/E1.11)**

### **Objector**

3294/10793                      *Mrs D J Laycock*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should not be allocated for employment use due to the problems that would arise in relation to access, car parking and road safety.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

8.38 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.11 above. I consider that an appropriate vehicular access could be obtained from Leeds Road, with acceptable sight-lines and provision for turning traffic. If necessary, action relating to parked vehicles causing obstruction on Leeds Road and/or Ashlands Road can be taken under existing alternative powers.

8.39 Accordingly, I conclude that the employment use allocation for the site is appropriate and supports national, regional and local policy relating to sustainable development.

### **Recommendation**

**8.40 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than as set out in my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11 above.**

**SOM/K/TM20/82: The Wharfedale Cycleway, Wheatley Lane/A65, Ilkley (K/TM20)**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The cycleway would pass through the centre of a field, a vital and sensitive part of the Green Belt, and would be a visually intrusive urbanising element.
- It would result in the loss of some of the best and most versatile agricultural land in the area.
- There would be an increased risk to biosecurity through the possible carrying of disease and infective material to livestock along the route.

- As the cycleway would pass through land used as a riding school there would be a danger to cyclists, riders and horses.
- Its provision would lead to further harmful Green Belt development.
- The cycleway would divide a field, compromising its use.
- The proposal could lead to ‘rat-running’ of motorbikes, cycle racing, and a reduction in security and privacy.
- It would result in the loss of a hawthorn hedge, which provides shelter and protection for livestock, and horses and their riders.

### **Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 8.41 Objectors’ concerns are not with the principle of the provision of the cycleway itself but the detailed route it would take from Wheatley Lane eastwards. The land forms part of the visually important extensive swathe of Green Belt to the immediate east of Ben Rhydding. I do not consider that the provision of the cycleway within the Green Belt would materially conflict with the openness of the Green Belt or be inappropriate development. Nor would it represent a precedent for development there since the Green Belt notation would endure and would prevent future inappropriate forms of development. I do, however, share objectors’ concerns about the south-west – north-east alignment of the route across the field to the rear of Wheatley Lane. I consider that to avoid conflict with grazing animals it would be likely that any cycleway would need to be fenced, and bisecting the field to provide 2 long and relatively narrow sections would result in operational and management difficulties for the farm/riding school.
- 8.42 The Council has indicated that this route has been shown for directness and ease of gradient. However, the field is only very gently sloping and a diagonal route across it would result in only a marginal saving in distance when considered within the context of the route’s overall length and when compared with an alignment that might follow the field’s western and northern perimeter. Any slight advantages to be gained from the Council’s favoured alignment would be outweighed by the problems already outlined. If the route were to pass to either the immediate east or west of the Wheatley Grange complex I consider it likely that there would be additional potential conflict between the use of the cycleway and farming/riding activities.
- 8.43 If the route followed the western field boundary it would pass close to the rear of dwellings fronting Wheatley Lane. However, in the case of the terraced housing backing onto the northern and southern portions of the field these are already separated by access roads. In these circumstances I do not consider that concerns about reduced security or increased risk of crime would be a sufficient justification for resisting such a re-alignment.
- 8.44 Positioning to provide adequate forward visibility would be a detailed design issue. The alignment of the cycleway along the southern side of Leeds Road, and whether this would necessitate removal of hedging, would also be matters for detailed planning consideration, as would width and surfacing, barriers to access by other vehicles, and whether the cycleway was to be lit. In this latter regard, given the essentially open and rural nature of the land at Wheatley Grange, I consider it likely this would be intrusive and inappropriate.
- 8.45 Positioning of the cycleway in this way would maintain the usefulness of the field, involve little loss of agricultural land, be likely to be less visually intrusive, and have less potential for causing conflict between cyclists and horse riders. As the public already has

access to Wheatley Grange through its use as a riding school I do not consider there to be a strong likelihood of increased risk to biosecurity from passing users of the cycleway.

- 8.46 Objectors have suggested alternative routes for the cycleway. These include the use of Wheatley Lane, with cyclists making a right-angled turn from this road at the junction with the A65 to follow a route along the southern side of this latter road. However, I accept the Council's view that there is insufficient width within the highway to provide for a revised footway/cycleway near to the junction along Leeds Road. Even if this junction was to be signalised there may be difficulties in building in a sequence to cater for cyclists. A route which provides greater separation for cyclists from other road traffic is also likely to be safer and more attractive to potential users. An alternative of the use of a footpath and bridleway connecting Ben Rhydding Drive with Burley-in-Wharfedale has also been suggested. This would involve far greater ascent and descent than a route utilising the valley bottom and consequently I consider this would be a greater deterrent to use.

### **Recommendation**

- 8.47 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:**

**The route of the TM20 Cycleway Improvements as shown on the Proposals Map bisecting the field between Wheatley Grange and Wheatley Lane, Ben Rhydding should be deleted and a route passing down the western and northern boundaries of the field should be substituted.**

**SOM/K/TM23/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

### **Objector**

4080/10950 *Mr Matthew Goulden*

### **Summary of Objection**

- An airport should be built.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 8.48 I have considered this site under K/H2.34 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

- 8.49 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than any approved amendment to the conservation area boundary being shown on the Proposals Map.**

## Chapter 10 Built Heritage and the Historic Environment

**SOM/K/BH7/22: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (K/E1.11)**

### Objector

1797/4657 *Mr J M Mundiñano*

### Summary of Objection

- The site should be designated as a conservation area.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.1 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.11 above, where I conclude that the land is appropriately allocated for employment use.

10.2 The UDP process is not the correct vehicle for the designation of conservation areas.

### Recommendation

10.3 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP except as set out in my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11 above.**

**SOM/K/BH7/28: Banklands Avenue (West), Silsden (K/H2.7)**

### Objector

933/4655 *Miss Liz Groves*

### Summary of Objection

- The area should be declared a conservation area.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.4 Development plans are not the vehicle for designating conservation areas. This is the province of other planning legislation.

### Recommendation

10.5 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP in response to this objection, but reference should be made to H2.7/8 above.**

**SOM/K/BH7/39: Off Lees Lane (South), Haworth (K/H2.32)**

**Objector**

89/2019

*Ms Gill Penny*

**Summary of Objection**

- Haworth should become a conservation area and all new housing should be stopped.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

10.6 I have considered the allocation of the objection land for housing in relation to K/H2.32 above, to which reference should be made. Much of Haworth is already designated as a conservation area whose boundary has been recently reviewed by the Council. I am not aware of any intention to extend the area to this part of Lees and the UDP process is not the correct vehicle for the designation of conservation areas.

**Recommendation**

10.7 **See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.32.**

**SOM/K/BH7/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

**Objectors**

1742/10057

*Haworth Parish Council*

2438/2105

*Mr David Robertson-Brown*

3719/4497

*Mr Andrew Falkingham*

3721/11251

*Mrs Sarah Louise Falkingham*

3909/6568

*Mrs S F Granby*

4113/5249

*Mrs G Robertson-Brown*

4120/7202

*Mr Keith Hooley*

**Summary of Objections**

- The conservation area should be extended to include the site.
- Housing on the site would ruin the whole structure of the village and damage the local economy. There would be a loss of Haworth heritage.
- The site should be made a business/recreational area.
- Any future development should retain the façade of the buildings and a sense of open space around them.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

10.8 The above objections were made in the context of the FDDP when the site was allocated for housing. Within the RDDP this allocation has been deleted. These objections reflect those raised in respect of K/H2.34, which I have considered above and to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

**10.9 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than any approved amendment to the conservation area boundary being shown on the Proposals Map.**

**SOM/K/BH7/41: Weavers Hill, Haworth (K/H2.35)**

## **Objector**

530/2029

*Mr J B Metcalfe*

## **Summary of Objection**

- The housing allocation should be deleted and the conservation area boundary repositioned to the outside edge of the access road to the car park.
- The site should be re-allocated for recreational use as a sports field or conservation meadow.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

10.10 Reference should be made to K/H2.35 above where I have considered this site in detail. In response to objections in respect of this I have concluded that the field comprising the bulk of the site should be designated as Green Belt. I have seen no substantive evidence that there is a need for the allocation of the land for use as a sports field.

## **Recommendation**

**10.11 See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.35 above.**

## Chapter 11 Community Facilities

**SOM/K/CF1/3: Bolling Road, Ilkley (K/H1.10)**

### Objector

983/5798 *Mr William Boocock*

### Summary of Objection

- Proposals for Bolling Road School (now re-named Ben Rhydding Primary School) are deeply limited, offering no improvement and retaining an old-fashioned building with temporary classrooms and a split site.
- It would be better to build a new school on part of the playing field so that the playing area would be adjacent to it, with the old site developed with housing to pay for this.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

11.1 I have considered this objection in relation to SOM/K/H1/255 above, to which reference should be made.

### Recommendation

11.2 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/CF1/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

### Objector

4120/7314 *Mr Keith Hooley*

### Summary of Objection

- The conservation area should be extended to include surrounding sites like this one and the school preserved and used for recreational use.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

11.3 I have considered this and other objections relating to this site under K/H2.34, to which reference should be made.

### Recommendation

11.4 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than any approved amendment to the conservation area boundary being shown on the Proposals Map.**



**SOM/K/CF1/377: Land adjacent to the proposed Silsden Eastern Bypass**

**Objector**

3869/10923 *Miss Vera M Waugh*

**Summary of Objection**

- A choice of two schools, one old and one new, will not bring joy and happiness to parents, children or the town.
- Congestion/danger due to location near bypass.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.5 The Council advises that, should the residential allocations go ahead, a new primary school would be required. This site is towards the eastern edge of Silsden and, whilst it would be reasonably well located to serve the proposed residential areas, the existing schools are more centrally located.
- 11.6 I am recommending the deletion of the new housing allocations at Silsden and, without these, I doubt that there will be any need for a new school since the Council indicates that there are currently 109 surplus places at the two existing schools. However, if additional education provision is required to serve the existing population of Silsden, a site more accessible to those residents should be sought.
- 11.7 In relation to the detailed points made by the objector, it is not unusual for parents to have a choice of schools and most would tend to send their children to the closest. The issue of traffic would be dealt with at the detailed planning stage but the Council indicates that access would be from a distributor road leading from the bypass.
- 11.8 I consider the Green Belt boundary around Silsden elsewhere in this report, and recommend that housing and employment allocations to the east and south of Silsden be deleted, and that the land be included within the Green Belt. This site adjoins housing allocations K/H2.7 and K/H2.8, and the Council will wish to assess whether the site meets the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

- 11.9 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the school site adjacent to the proposed Silsden eastern bypass.**

**SOM/K/CF3/3: Bolling Road, Ilkley (K/H1.10)**

**Objector**

4695/10941 *1st Ben Rhydding Scout Group*

**Summary of Objection**

- Part of the playing fields should be allocated as a Scout and Guide headquarters.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.10 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H1.10 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

11.11 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/CF3/19: Leeds Road, Ilkley (K/H1.9)**

#### **Objectors**

3636/7105                      *Mrs Barbara J Cussons*  
4695/10946                    *1st Ben Rhydding Scout Group*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be designated as public open space or for recreational use and/or for educational/recreation use.
- Development would add more pupils to the schools and take away flexibility for future expansion.
- The plan should be amended to allocate land for use as a Scout and Guide headquarters.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.12 I have considered these objections in relation to K/H1.9, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

11.13 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/CF3/23: Valley Drive, Ilkley (K/H1.11)**

#### **Objector**

4255/10767                    *Ilkley Parish Council*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- As there is a great lack of recreation open space and playing fields within Ilkley and surrounding area the playing field should be left dormant until the outcome of expansion at Ilkley Grammar School is settled successfully.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.14 Only the school buildings and their immediate surroundings are allocated for housing and I have considered objections to this in respect of K/H1.11 above. The associated school

playing fields are to be retained and are to be protected as playing fields under Policy OS3. The Education Authority has indicated that the school is surplus to educational requirements. I do not consider any modification to the RDDP to be necessary.

### **Recommendation**

**11.15 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/CF3/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The buildings should be retained and used for various community uses.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.16 I have considered this site in relation to K/H2.34 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

**11.17 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than any approved amendment to the conservation area boundary being shown on the Proposals Map.**

**SOM/K/CF3/41: Weavers Hill, Haworth (K/H2.35)**

### **Objector**

4056/10749                      *Mrs Susan Hook*

### **Summary of Objection**

- There are too many houses in Haworth and not enough facilities. An extra doctors' surgery is needed.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.18 I have considered this site in relation to K/H2.35 above, to which reference should be made. I have seen no substantive evidence that a further doctors' surgery is required.

### **Recommendation**

**11.19 See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.35 above.**

**SOM/K/CF3/78: Ashlar Close, Haworth (K/H2.33)**

**Objector**

1742/5956                      *Haworth Parish Council*

**Summary of Objection**

- The site should be for community use and not housing.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.20 In response to objections in respect of K/H2.33 above, I have concluded and recommended that this site should not be designated as safeguarded land. The Parish Council has not specified to what type of community use it would wish the land to be put. Any proposal that was to come forward would need to be judged against Policy CF3, which involves a sequential approach to the use of land for community purposes. In this light I do not consider any further modification to the RDDP to be necessary.

**Recommendation**

11.21 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site's designation as safeguarded land.**

**SOM/K/CF3/323.02: Land to the east of Wheatley Lane, Ilkley**

**Objector**

3699/10937                      *Wharfedale Division Guide Association*

**Summary of Objection**

- The proposed Park and Ride facility for Ben Rhydding station would require land currently used as a Scout and Guide headquarters. The objection site should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for recreation and community facilities to provide an alternative site for the headquarters.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.22 The objection site comprises the northern portion of a roughly triangular grassed field fronting onto the eastern side of Wheatley Lane and which is wholly contained in the Green Belt. Whilst the north-western and eastern boundaries of the objection site follow those of the field there is no defined southern boundary, this being drawn to leave the balance of the field for the accommodation of the Park and Ride facility. I have commented in detail on the Park and Ride proposal and its impact on the Scout and Guide headquarters in response to objections on K/TM7.4. If my recommendation on this is accepted this would probably remove the requirement for the Scout headquarters to relocate.

11.23 Nevertheless, in terms of this objection, I agree with the Council that the land fulfils the purposes of including land within the Green Belt as set out in PPG2 and that the boundary to the Green Belt in this location is robust. If land were to be allocated for a new headquarters this would have to be under either policies relating to recreation land or under Policy CF3. Provision of a replacement building would not be compatible with Policies OS1 - OS3 relating to open space. A sequential approach to the search for sites for community facilities is applied under Policy CF3 and this land, being a greenfield site with another allocation (Green Belt), would fall into the final, and therefore least desirable, category in the sequence. As a consequence, I do not consider that either this, or any improvements to highway safety that could result from having a different access to the present Scout headquarters site, amount to exceptional circumstances for releasing the site from the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

**11.24 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than those in relation to K/TM7.4.**

**SOM/K/CF3/323.03 & SOM/K/GB1/323.03: Land to the east of Wheatley Lane, Ilkley (SOM/K/OS2/323.03)**

### **Objector**

*4695/10943 & 10944 1st Ben Rhydding Scout Group*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The proposed Park and Ride facility for Ben Rhydding station would require land currently used as a Scout and Guide headquarters. The objection site should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for recreation and community facilities to provide an alternative site for the headquarters.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.25 This objection is substantially the same as that made by the Wharfedale Division Guide Association in respect of which my conclusions are set out above on SOM/K/CF3/323.02.

### **Recommendation**

**11.26 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than those in relation to K/TM7.4.**

**SOM/K/CF3/353.02: Ilkley Middle School Playing Fields, Wheatley Lane, Ilkley**

### **Objector**

*4695/10929 1st Ben Rhydding Scout Group*

## Summary of Objection

- The plan does not identify any alternative sites for the relocation of the Scout and Guide headquarters to the east of Wheatley Lane, which is on land designated for Park and Ride provision. The plan should be amended to allocate land for this purpose on this site.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 11.27 The Scout Group's principal objection relating to Park and Ride provision in respect of their existing headquarters has been considered under K/TM7.4. If my recommendation on that matter is accepted then this should overcome this and related objections seeking possible land allocations on other sites.
- 11.28 This current objection seeks the allocation for a new headquarters of the northern portion of existing school playing fields, which the plan designates as playing fields under Policy OS3. Having regard to the provision of community facilities under Policy CF3, the RDDP indicates that it is very difficult to anticipate and allocate sites for the range of needs found in the diverse communities of the district. A sequential approach to the search for sites for community facilities is applied under this policy and this land, being a greenfield site with another allocation (playing fields), would fall into the final, and therefore least desirable, category in the sequence. In light of this and my recommendation on K/TM7.4 I consider no modification of the RDDP to be necessary.

## Recommendation

- 11.29 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## SOM/K/CF4/234: Land adj to Airedale Hospital, Steeton with Eastburn

### Objector

3842/10110                      *Taywood Homes Ltd*

## Summary of Objection

- The land is not within the ownership or control of the Airedale NHS Trust, should not be classed as non-operational hospital land and should be added to the site to the west, which should be allocated for housing.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 11.30 The objection was made in respect of the FDDP. Within the RDDP the piece of land subject to the objection was included within the adjacent K/UR5.4 allocation and I have dealt with this objection above in relation to that allocation.

## Recommendation

- 11.31 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## Chapter 12 Open Land in Settlements

### **K/OS1.5 AND SOM/K/GB1/257: Howden Road, Silsden**

#### **Objectors**

3164/7937                      *Mrs Janet Boyce*  
3243/7933                      *Mr Christopher Victor Boyce*  
4084/5015                      *J and S Mitchell*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The urban greenspace notation appears to include houses and gardens at Lowfield Crescent.
- The land should be included in the Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.1 Following on from my recommendations to delete the housing allocations and bypass, the deletion of this urban greenspace designation would be logical. The land does not differ from the land to the east which is shown as Green Belt in the RDDP. This farmland would, in the absence of a bypass, continue to extend right up to the rear boundaries of properties in Silsden. The Green Belt should have the same extent, and would prevent the expansion of Silsden in this direction, as well as protecting the open countryside from encroachment. The exceptional circumstances for including additional land in the Green Belt are set out elsewhere in this report.

#### **Recommendation**

12.2 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the urban greenspace notation from site K/OS1.5, and by the inclusion of the site within the Green Belt, with the Green Belt boundary following the line of rear property boundaries.**

### **SOM/K/OS1/3: Bolling Road, Ilkley (K/H1.10)**

#### **Objectors**

498/2213                      *Mrs Jane Lloyd*  
581/2215                      *Mr and Mrs M E and W G Pitt*  
1395/2214                      *Mr Rupert Kerington*  
4696/11255                      *David & Helen Kidman*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be retained as a green, open area with no housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.3 These objections were made in response to the proposed designation of part of the playing field as a housing site in the FDDP. I have considered them in relation to K/H1.10 above.

### **Recommendation**

12.4 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/OS1/17: Keighley Road/Belton Road, Silsden (K/E1.4)**

#### **Objector**

3850/7301 *Bradford Environmental Action Trust*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land reserved as open space.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.5 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.4 above, where I conclude that the employment allocation is inappropriate and should be deleted. I also indicate that open space use would not be acceptable, and that the land should be retained for agricultural purposes and designated as Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

12.6 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP except as set out in relation to reference K/E1.4 above.**

### **SOM/K/OS1/18: Sykes Lane, Silsden (K/E1.9)**

#### **Objector**

3850/7307 *Bradford Environmental Action Trust*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The employment allocation E1.9 is prone to flooding. It should be zoned as open space or Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.7 I deal with this objection under reference E1.9 above, where I conclude that some of the land should be included in the Green Belt.



## **Recommendation**

12.8 **My recommendation is given under reference E1.9 above.**

**SOM/K/OS1/19: Leeds Road, Ilkley (K/H1.9)**

### **Objector**

2768/7721 *Mr Andrew D Walbank*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The area should be retained as urban greenspace for recreational use by the school and others out of school hours as there is little level space left in the town.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.9 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H1.9, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

12.10 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/OS1/22: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (K/E1.11)**

### **Objector**

4255/7313 *Ilkley Parish Council*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be allocated as urban greenspace instead of employment use.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.11 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.11 above, where I conclude that the allocation of the land for employment use is appropriate.

12.12 The RDDP seeks to ensure that some publicly accessible recreational open space is provided as part of the employment development.

## **Recommendation**

12.13 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than as set out in my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11.**

**SOM/K/OS1/38: Off Lees Lane (North), Haworth (K/H2.31 & K/OS7.7)**

**Objector**

3123/11249

*Mr Keith C Wilson*

**Summary of Objection**

- Development would impinge on Murgatroyd Wood, which forms an important wildlife and landscape feature in the valley, and would destroy the rural character of Haworth on which much of its tourist trade is founded.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.14 Within the RDDP the objection land is now allocated as village greenspace. I have considered this objection in relation to SOM/K/H1/38 above, to which reference should be made.

**Recommendation**

12.15 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/OS1/39: Off Lees Lane (South), Haworth (K/H2.32)**

**Objector**

3123/11250

*Mr Keith C Wilson*

**Summary of Objection**

- The housing allocation should be deleted and the site allocated as urban greenspace.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.16 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H2.32 above, to which reference should be made.

**Recommendation**

12.17 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site's safeguarded land designation K/UR5.32.**

**SOM/K/OS1/78: Ashlar Close, Haworth (K/H2.33)**

**Objector**

3123/5953

*Mr Keith C Wilson*

## Summary of Objection

- The land should not be designated for housing but should be urban greenspace.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.18 I have considered this site in relation to K/H2.33 above, to which reference should be made. In respect of this particular objection urban greenspaces are the most significant greenspaces in terms of size and prominence within the urban areas. This site is not within an urban area and if it were to have any protective designation it would be more appropriately considered as village greenspace. Nevertheless, in considering K/H2.33 I have concluded that the land is of a different character to the wider village greenspace that has been identified to the north. I consider no modification to the RDDP to be necessary other than its deletion as safeguarded land, which I have discussed in respect of K/H2.33.

## Recommendation

12.19 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site's safeguarded land designation K/UR5.33.**

**SOM/K/OS1/215: Silverdale, Primrose Street, Keighley**

## Objector

4213/10146                  *Emma Kierney*

## Summary of Objection

- The boundary of the urban greenspace at Silverdale is out of date and does not follow any physical features. It includes parts of the house and most of the curtilage within the urban greenspace.
- The western and northern sections of the curtilage are of no public value.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.20 As I saw on my site visit, and as agreed by the Council, the urban greenspace boundary as it applies to Silverdale fails to correspond to physical features. However, the objector's suggestion to tie the boundary to the bank south of the house and the stream to the west would omit from the urban greenspace significant open areas. In intermediate and long distance views the house and its neighbour, 47 Primrose Street, appear somewhat separate from the other residential development to the north. The substantial open and largely green sections of the curtilage north and west of the house can be seen in these views and form parts of the main Parkwood urban greenspace which extends east, west and south of Silverdale and its neighbour.

12.21 Parkwood defines and separates different parts of the urban area of Keighley, and is an attractive hillside. The objection land, as part of the larger urban greenspace, contributes to its functions, at a point where the urban greenspace is relatively narrow. The area around the house at Silverdale has value in terms set out in PPG17. Use in conjunction with the house does not detract much from the openness of the site. A major part of the

curtilage is grassed. Where there is parking, vehicles and caravans are not present permanently.

12.22 The urban greenspace boundary would be improved by following features which can be seen on the ground, and the Council does not wish to include in the urban greenspace areas which are built-up. The best solution, using clear physical features which do not omit open land from the urban greenspace, is that suggested by the Council at the Inquiry session which took place on site i.e. basically utilising the retaining walls on 3 sides of the house. This would mean including in the urban greenspace some hard surfaced areas and the garage, but, for the reasons I have given, this is preferable to drawing the boundary back to the next obvious line, as proposed in the objection.

12.23 Development around the house requiring planning permission would be assessed against Policy OS1 in the case of those areas thus included in the urban greenspace. In the light of the open nature of most of this extensive curtilage, this is not unreasonable.

12.24 The redrawn boundary would no longer join up with the boundary around 47 Primrose Street. The Council would have to consider what action to take in relation to the boundary at this property.

### **Recommendation**

**12.25 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by redrafting the boundary of the urban greenspace at Silverdale, Primrose Street, Keighley, so that the boundary follows the retaining walls immediately north, west and south of the house, and the north wall of the garage where this continues the line of the southern retaining wall.**

**SOM/K/OS2/3:                      Bolling Road, Ilkley (K/H1.10)**

### **Objectors**

64/2232	<i>Mrs S L Hartley</i>
197/2220	<i>Mr Stewart M Bannister</i>
221/2218	<i>Mr Malcolm and Mrs Audrey Beardshaw</i>
400/2234	<i>Mr Roger Glister</i>
542/2216	<i>Mr and Mrs Newton</i>
653/2249	<i>Mr Martyn Shaw</i>
678/2244	<i>Dr Roger Soames</i>
679/2243	<i>Mrs Kathryn Soames</i>
735/2229	<i>Mr E L Twite</i>
955/5224	<i>Mrs Audrea Moore</i>
1276/2237	<i>Ms Jill Campbell</i>
1325/2241	<i>Mr Simon Muncaster</i>
1389/5223	<i>Mrs Julie Rawlinson</i>
1548/2239	<i>Mr Christopher Horne</i>
1644/2226	<i>Mr and Mrs T D Hennessey</i>
2278/10479	<i>Mr Richard Garnett</i>
2906/11168	<i>Mrs Elspeth Anne Holmes</i>
3692/2221	<i>Mr R Sharpe</i>
3694/11167	<i>Wharfedale District Scout Council</i>
4515/7480	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs J H &amp; J V Moorhouse</i>

## Summary of Objections

- The land should be left as a recreational facility.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.26 These objections were made in response to the allocation of part of the larger area of open space being allocated for housing within the FDDP. This allocation was deleted from the RDDP, the whole field being designated as playing fields protected under Policy OS3. Therefore no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

## Recommendation

12.27 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## SOM/K/OS2/19: Leeds Road, Ilkley (K/H1.9)

### Objectors

333/2114	<i>Mrs Jean M Dobson</i>
949/9379	<i>Mrs D E Lowe</i>
1195/4661	<i>Mr B R &amp; Mrs K Wilkinson</i>
1226/4664	<i>Mrs Stephanie McNeice</i>
1289/3240	<i>Mrs Mavis Thronton</i>
2768/7698	<i>Mr Andrew D Walbank</i>
3636/6744	<i>Mrs Barbara J Cussons</i>
3845/6557	<i>Mr Julian R Haigh</i>
3861/6545	<i>Mr M Rayner</i>

## Summary of Objections

- The site should remain as a recreation area or a park should be created.
- Concern over the possible creation of an access through St Mary's Close.
- There should be an adequate buffer zone of trees and shrubs on the north and east sides to provide privacy.
- Development on the land is not necessary.
- Development would lead to a sense of claustrophobia whereas now the land gives a pleasing and welcoming aspect to the approach to Ilkley along Leeds Road.
- Space is needed for school expansion and the land should be left for recreational use by the school and others.
- The site should be positively allocated as public open space/recreation.
- Development would lead to increased parking and traffic problems.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.28 I have considered these objections in relation to K/H1.9, to which reference should be made.

## Recommendation

12.29 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/OS2/22: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (K/E1.11)**

### **Objectors**

573/5763	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs John &amp; Dorothy Penwarden</i>
877/5745	<i>Miss W Jennings</i>
882/5744	<i>Mrs M A Jennings</i>
927/7675	<i>Ms Elizabeth Cunliffe</i>
1106/5741	<i>Miss Allison Jennings</i>
1705/3247	<i>Mrs Joan Steca</i>
2058/5762	<i>Mr F &amp; Mrs H Thornton</i>
2139/5761	<i>Mr Raymond Knowles</i>
2140/5760	<i>Mrs Barbara Davy</i>
2257/9469	<i>Mrs Griet Butterfield</i>
2296/4909	<i>Mrs Lesley Anne Greene</i>
2371/5759	<i>Mr Paul Greene</i>
2768/7793	<i>Mr Andrew D Walbank</i>
3235/7920	<i>Mrs Hilary Myers</i>
3651/7660	<i>Ilkley Design Statement Group</i>
3824/6549	<i>Mrs Ackerman</i>
3829/4789	<i>Mrs Jacqui S M Whiteley</i>
3833/5174	<i>Mr David L Whiteley</i>
4244/6591	<i>Mr Tomasz Sroka and Ms Laurie Lynn Kelly</i>
4255/7303	<i>Ilkley Parish Council</i>
4567/10156	<i>Mr William Greene</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be allocated as recreational open space instead of employment.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.30 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.11 above, where I conclude that the land is appropriately allocated for employment use.

12.31 The RDDP states that development of the site should include publicly accessible recreational open space and a cycleway, thus making some provision to remedy any deficiencies in the area. I note that the land is used informally as recreational open space by local residents and youth organisations that have premises in the immediate vicinity, but also that there is other open space on the south side of Leeds Road, opposite the site, so that the land is not the only facility in the immediate locality.

12.32 I consider that the land is suitable and needed for employment uses in furtherance of the sustainable development objectives of national, regional and local policy, and that the proposed inclusion of some recreational open space would help to meet any local need.

### **Recommendation**

12.33 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP except as set out in my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11 above.**

**SOM/K/OS2/23: Valley Drive, Ilkley (K/H1.11)**

**Objector**

3694/5772

*Wharfedale District Scout Council*

**Summary of Objection**

- Part of the site should be allocated for a replacement Scout and Guide headquarters.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.34 I recommend in respect of K/TM7.4 that the RDDP should be modified to make it clear that the Ben Rhydding station Park and Ride proposal does not need to use the existing Scout and Guide headquarters site. There is therefore no need to identify a site to replace the headquarters.

**Recommendation**

12.35 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/OS2/24: Woodside Road, Silsden**

**Objector**

3513/7312

*Mr Lawrence Sydney Peake*

**Summary of Objection**

- In view of the shortage of recreation land in west Silsden, this site should be retained as open amenity land.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.36 I consider this objection under reference UR5.14 above, where I conclude that the site should be included in the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

12.37 **My recommendation is given under reference UR5.14 above.**

**SOM/K/OS2/28: Banklands Avenue (West), Silsden (K/H2.7)**

**Objector**

3562/3875

*Miss A M Hurrell*

**Summary of Objection**

- This land should be left as a recreational area.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.38 I consider this objection under reference SOM/K/GB1/28 below, where I conclude that the land should form part of the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

12.39 **My recommendation is given under reference SOM/K/GB1/28 below.**

### **SOM/K/OS2/40: Butt Lane, Haworth (K/H2.34)**

#### **Objectors**

4080/5790	<i>Mr Matthew Goulden</i>
4113/5791	<i>Mrs G Robertson-Brown</i>
4120/7201	<i>Mr Keith Hooley</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The conservation area should be extended to include the site.
- The site should be made into a park and the buildings should have a sense of space around them.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.40 I have considered this site under K/H2.34 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

12.41 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than any approved amendment to the conservation area boundary being shown on the Proposals Map.**

### **SOM/K/OS2/41: Weavers Hill, Haworth (K/H2.35)**

#### **Objectors**

530/2031	<i>Mr J B Metcalfe</i>
4056/10537	<i>Mrs Susan Hook</i>
4057/10539	<i>Mr S Hook</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The area zoned for housing should be deleted and reallocated for recreational use as a sports field or conservation meadow.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.42 I have considered these objections in relation to K/H2.35, to which reference should be made.



## Recommendation

12.43 See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.35 above.

**SOM/K/OS2/323.03: Land to the east of Wheatley Lane, Ilkley (SOM/K/GB1/323.03 and SOM/K/CF3/323.03)**

### Objector

3694/11227 *Wharfedale District Scout Council*

### Summary of Objection

- The proposed Park and Ride facility for Ben Rhydding station would require land currently used as a Scout and Guide headquarters. The plan should be amended to allocate part of this Green Belt land as a site for a replacement Scout and Guide headquarters.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.44 I have considered this objection in relation to SOM/K/CF3/323.03, to which reference should be made.

## Recommendation

12.45 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.

**K/OS3.2: Ilkley Middle School, Valley Drive, Ilkley**

### Objectors

721/10759 *Mr Robert Alfred Tilley*  
2768/10760 *Mr Andrew D Walbank*  
4695/10942 *1st Ben Rhydding Scout Group*

### Summary of Objections

- Part of the school playing fields should be allocated for housing in order to fund the conversion of the adjacent school into a sixth form college for the overcrowded Grammar School.
- Part could be used to provide a replacement Scout and Guide headquarters.
- Part should be allocated for housing as a replacement for allocation K/H1.10.

Note: all of the objections seek the reallocation of the northern part of the playing fields.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.46 Decisions on the future of the former Ilkley Middle School as an educational facility are matters for the Local Education Authority. A decision has been made that the school is

not required for educational purposes, and as a consequence it is allocated for housing. There is therefore no place for a further such allocation on part of the playing fields to fund educational provision at the school.

12.47 I recommend in respect of K/TM7.4 that the RDDP should be modified to make it clear that the Ben Rhydding station Park and Ride proposal does not need to use the existing Scout and Guide headquarters site. There is no need to identify a site to replace the headquarters.

12.48 The Bolling Road housing allocation has been deleted from the RDDP, and my recommendation would not lead to the reinstatement of the allocation. Nevertheless, the question arises as to whether or not an alternative site should be allocated to replace the deleted allocation. In general terms, other sites in Ilkley are allocated for housing. Allocation is not based on measurements of need or demand arising in individual settlements, such that the loss of one site would require the identification of a replacement.

12.49 With specific reference to the objection land, it has been in use as playing fields for many years. The Council's evidence is that it continues to serve the community, and that there is scope for making fuller use of the facility. There is no evidence that an assessment has been undertaken to show that the site is surplus to requirements. In these circumstances allocation for housing would run contrary to national policy, and I conclude that the site should not be allocated for housing.

### **Recommendation**

12.50 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/OS3.3: Bolling Road Playing Fields (K/H1.10)**

#### **Objectors**

4382/10916                      *Mrs Anne Oddy*  
4695/10940                      *1st Ben Rhydding Scout Group*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be left as open space.
- The plan should be amended to allocate the land for a Scout and Guide headquarters.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.51 I have considered these objections in relation to K/H1.10 above, to which reference should be made.

#### **Recommendation**

12.52 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/OS3/3: Bolling Road, Ilkley (K/H1.10)**

#### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be retained as a playing field.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.53 These objections were made in response to the allocation of part of this larger open area for housing within the FDDP. This has been deleted from the RDDP and the land is allocated as playing fields together with the rest of the site, protected under Policy OS3. No modification to the RDDP is therefore necessary.

#### **Recommendation**

12.54 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/OS3/19: Leeds Road, Ilkley (K/H1.9)**

#### **Objectors**

929/11254	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs Jack &amp; Irene Barbara Burns</i>
949/9380	<i>Mrs D E Lowe</i>
3872/10996	<i>Mr Kenneth A Wardell</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site is virtually the only remaining 'green' recreational area close to this side of Ilkley town centre and is well used for dog exercising, walking and children's play.
- The land should remain as playing fields or be used for Ashlands School or as communal space.
- Development will diminish the Green Belt, increase traffic along Leeds Road and potentially create an access road through St Mary's Close.
- Development would increase parking problems in the area.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.55 I have considered these objections in relation to K/H1.9, to which reference should be made.

#### **Recommendation**

12.56 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/OS3/22: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (K/E1.11)**

**Objectors**

2710/6920                      *Miss Jessica Greene*  
3485/5178                      *Mrs Caroline James*

**Summary of Objections**

- The land should be used as playing fields rather than allocated for employment.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.57 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.11, SOM/K/OS1/22 and SOM/K/OS2/22 above. The RDDP proposes that the employment development of the site should include some publicly accessible recreational open space, and I note that other open space is allocated immediately to the south of Leeds Road, opposite the objection site.

12.58 I conclude that the site is appropriately allocated for employment use in support of the sustainable development objectives of national, regional and local policy.

**Recommendation**

**12.59 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP except as set out in my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11 above.**

**SOM/K/OS6/20/1: Station Road, Oxenhope (K/E1.22 part)**

**Objector**

3188/1977                      *Mrs Elizabeth Jane Mooney*

**Summary of Objection**

- The land between the burial ground and No. 11 Denholme Road should be allocated as allotments instead of for employment use.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.60 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.22 above, to which reference should be made.

**Recommendation**

**12.61 My recommendation is given under reference E1.22 above.**

**SOM/K/OS6/28 & SOM/K/OS6/28.01: Banklands Avenue (West), Silsden (K/H2.7)**

**Objectors**

1626/5591	<i>Mr and Mrs Wharton</i>
2328/3891	<i>Mr Raj Madhas</i>
2330/3889	<i>Mr Michael Banks</i>
2334/3892	<i>Mrs Margaret Banks</i>
2358/3888	<i>Mrs Joan Rothera</i>
2380/7286	<i>Mrs Gill Cartwright</i>
3562/3886	<i>Miss A M Hurrell</i>
3564/3887	<i>Mr Stephen Richard Wilson</i>
4322/3890	<i>Ilkley Woodcraft Folk</i>

**Summary of Objections**

- The well-used Bolton Road allotments should not be included in the housing allocation.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.62 The Council agrees with the objectors. As the allotments are indeed well-used I consider that they should be protected by Policy OS6. The Council has submitted a revised plan showing the full extent of the allotment area.

**Recommendation**

12.63 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by showing on the Proposals Map, as being subject to Policy OS6, all of the Bolton Road allotments, as depicted on the revised plan, attached to the Council's inquiry document BMDC/SITE/K/H2.7/2/WR.**

**K/OS7.1: Back Beck Lane, Addingham**

**Objector**

4150/4592 *Mrs M Johnson*

**Summary of Objection**

- This site found favour with the previous Inspector as a housing site and is so allocated in the adopted UDP.
- A housing development could be designed to retain the majority of the open area, to preserve the character of the conservation area and to preserve the settings of listed buildings.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.64 I deal with this objection under reference SOM/K/H1/111 above, where I conclude against a housing allocation.

## **Recommendation**

**12.65 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/OS7.2 and SOM/K/GB1/92: Land south of Main Street, Addingham**

### **Objectors**

3490/4603                      *Mr Dennis G Beaman*  
4199/10141                    *Clays Construction*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land allocated as village greenspace would be afforded greater protection if designated as Green Belt.
- The land should be partially allocated for housing and partially re-allocated as Recreation Open Space.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.66 I have considered the objection relating to the allocation of land for housing and the effective re-orientation of open space in relation to SOM/K/H1/275 & 276, to which reference should be made. In relation to that objection I have also concluded that the present Green Belt boundary is clear and robust and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amending the boundary to include the objection land within the Green Belt. The land is protected within the RDDP under Policy OS7. This is a strong policy in its own right preventing development that would result in the loss of open space that is important to the character, visual amenity and local identity of a settlement. I have concluded above that the land fulfils these important functions as part of the swathe of open countryside stretching to the heart of the village and so the land in its present form would be strongly protected. Consequently, no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

## **Recommendation**

**12.67 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/OS7/38: Land off Lees Lane (North), Haworth (K/H2.31 & K/OS7.7)**

### **Objector**

1742/5777                      *Haworth Parish Council*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The designated village greenspace should be extended to include this site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.68 I have considered this site in relation to K/H2.31 above, to which reference should be made. This objection was made to the FDDP when the site was allocated for housing. This was changed in the RDDP to village greenspace, a designation which I have recommended should remain.

### **Recommendation**

12.69 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/OS7/39: Off Lees Lane (South), Haworth (K/H2.32)**

### **Objectors**

1742/5778	<i>Haworth Parish Council</i>
2438/9472	<i>Mr David Robertson-Brown</i>
2457/3963	<i>Mrs M H Merrett</i>
2458/7199	<i>Mr R R P and Mrs A L Ackroyd</i>
3876/6553	<i>Mr A R Merrett</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be included within the village greenspace designation.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.70 I have considered these objections in relation to K/H2.32 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

12.71 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.32.**

**SOM/K/OS7/63: Parsons Lane, Addingham (K/UR5.1)**

### **Objectors**

2705/7020	<i>Mrs Elizabeth Jane Whiteside</i>
3478/6023	<i>Mr Alan Jerome</i>
3486/6092	<i>Mrs Patricia Pearson</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- Development here would be wrong. The land should be village greenspace.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.72 I have considered this site in relation to K/UR5.1 above where I have concluded and recommended that the safeguarded land designation within the RDDP should be deleted and the land included as part of the extended Green Belt around the west of the village. As the site lies on the edge of, rather than within, the village I do not consider the site's

designation as village greenspace under Policy OS7 would be appropriate. The land's designation as Green Belt should result in the retention of its general openness.

### **Recommendation**

**12.73 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.1, and the land's inclusion within the Green Belt.**

**SOM/K/OS7/78: Ashlar Close, Haworth (K/H2.33)**

### **Objector**

1742/5958                      *Haworth Parish Council*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The site should be used for landscaping.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.74 I have considered this site in detail in relation to K/H2.33 in respect of which I have recommended that the site's safeguarded designation within the RDDP should be deleted. I have also indicated that because of its different characteristics it would not be appropriate to add the land to the extensive area of village greenspace to the north, in respect of which Policy OS7 is applicable.

### **Recommendation**

**12.75 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.33.**

**SOM/K/OS7/104 & SOM/K/UR4/104: Land at Green End Road, East Morton**

### **Objector**

3867/5598 & 5599            *Miss Clare Shuttleworth*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be designated as village greenspace as it preserves and enhances the character of the conservation area and the historical integrity of the village.
- It brings the countryside into the village, is a visual amenity and is of biodiversity value.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.76 The land was unallocated in the RDDP. However, PPG17 emphasises the protection of important open space. The Council accepts that most of the site suggested for inclusion as village greenspace by the objector falls within the PPG17 definition of open space. I agree that the site performs several important functions. These include that of making a considerable contribution to the character and setting of the village generally, and the



conservation area in particular, especially as it is both prominent and possesses a significant amount of mature tree cover. The site is well over the 0.4 hectare threshold above which sites may be designated as village greenspace under Policy OS7. I concur with the views of both the objector and the Council that the land should benefit from this protection.

12.77 In terms of the boundaries of the site as suggested by the objector, the Council proposes the exclusion of the north-western tip, mostly to the north of the stone aqueduct, since this benefits from a residential planning permission where construction is underway. The Council also suggests the inclusion of an additional strip of land flanking the western side of the Morton Beck and a southerly extension to include a further element of wooded slope. I agree that these are sensible suggestions, the latter 2 elements helping to define clear boundaries to the site.

### **Recommendation**

12.78 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the allocation of land at Green End Road, East Morton as village greenspace, as shown on the plan accompanying the Council's Inquiry evidence.**

**SOM/K/OS7/211: Mill Hill, Haworth**

### **Objector**

1742/10056 *Haworth Parish Council*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The designated village greenspace should be extended to include the triangle of land to the west of the railway line and lying between the existing greenspace boundary and the conservation area.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.79 Most village greenspace designations have been drawn to exclude built development such as residential properties where this would prejudice open character and amenity value. I consider that the 2 properties on the site, and their domestic curtilages, are different in character to the village greenspace to the north. Their extensive planting provides considerable enclosure and this area is more closely related to the other residential properties to their western side. As a result, I do not consider it would be appropriate to extend the village greenspace notation to include the suggested area.

### **Recommendation**

12.80 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/OS8/243: Land at Lea Hill, Back Leeming, Oxenhope**  
**SOM/K/OS8/245: Land to rear of 27-41 Denholme Road, Oxenhope**  
**SOM/K/OS8/246: Land at Green Street, Oxenhope**  
**SOM/K/OS8/247: Land at Station Road, Oxenhope**

<b>SOM/K/OS8/248:</b>	<b>Land adj Leeming Water/Yate Lane, Oxenhope</b>
<b>SOM/K/OS8/249:</b>	<b>Land at Keighley Road, Oxenhope</b>
<b>SOM/K/OS8/250:</b>	<b>Land at Moorhouse Court, Oxenhope</b>
<b>SOM/K/OS8/251:</b>	<b>Land at Moorhouse Lane, Oxenhope</b>
<b>SOM/K/OS8/252:</b>	<b>Land at Cross Lane/Hebden Bridge Road, Oxenhope</b>
<b>SOM/K/OS8/253:</b>	<b>Land at Grant Street, Oxenhope</b>
<b>SOM/K/OS8/254:</b>	<b>Land adj West Croft, Hebden Bridge Road, Oxenhope</b>

### **Objectors**

2221/10061                      *Mr Derek Allen*  
2222/10072                      *Oxenhope Parish Council*

### **Summary of Objections**

- These sites, identified in the Oxenhope Village Design Statement because of their value as open land, should be allocated in the RDDP as village greenspace.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.81 All of these sites are less than 0.4 hectares in area – some much less. For reasons given in the Policy Framework volume of this report the sites should not be shown on the RDDP Proposals Map. Briefly, they are too small and varied in character and function. Policy OS8 in any case protects small sites which are important to the character, visual amenity and identity of settlements.

### **Recommendation**

12.82 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## Chapter 13 Green Belt

### **K/GB1.2: Hollins Lane, Utley, Keighley**

#### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- There is no reason to remove the land from the Green Belt other than to support housing proposals on site K/H2.21. It would be a wholly unwarranted erosion of the Green Belt.
- Removal of land from the Green Belt would result in development that would add to highway safety and traffic congestion problems, damage the environment and exacerbate drainage problems.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.1 The land the Council is suggesting deleting from the Green Belt comprises part of the extensive grounds of Whinburn, a former residential school, and part of a grassed field, No. 9259. The Green Belt boundary within the adopted UDP follows an arbitrary line bisecting the grounds of Whinburn and follows no physical feature across field No. 9259. As shown within the RDDP the boundary follows clear physical features of fencing, trees and dry stone walling and in my view is far more robust, logical and defensible than that of the adopted UDP. Most of the land comprises the rear grounds of Whinburn which are wooded and which do not have the quality of openness, relating more to the built form of Keighley than the surrounding countryside. I consider that the rationalisation of the boundary in this manner as part of the Council's review of the Green Belt is an exceptional circumstance that warrants the deletion of the land in question from the Green Belt.

13.2 It appears that much of the objectors' concern is that removal from the Green Belt could result in housing development on the land. I have concluded in relation to SOM/K/H1/113, which includes that part of field No. 9259 that is to be excluded from the Green Belt, that this land should not be allocated for residential development. I have also concluded and recommended in relation to site K/UR5.24, which abuts part of the objection land, that this should remain as safeguarded land. The land that is now excluded from the Green Belt is unallocated within the RDDP and any proposal for development on it would fall to be judged against relevant policies of the plan. These include those offering protection to Whinburn as a listed building, and to its grounds, which are included in English Heritage's National Parks and Gardens Register. It is my overall view that no modification to the RDDP is necessary.

#### **Recommendation**

13.3 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/GB1.4: North of Addingham**

## Objectors

3831/7522	<i>Cala Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd</i>
4174/9583	<i>Keyland Developments Ltd</i>
4307/6815	<i>Clays of Addingham Ltd</i>

## Summary of Objections

- To state without full supporting information and evidence that there are development pressures in the area is not to demonstrate that very exceptional circumstances exist, which are necessary to justify a Green Belt extension.
- Circumstances have not changed significantly since the adoption of the present UDP in 1998 to warrant the extension of the Green Belt.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 13.4 The RDDP includes the addition to the Green Belt of nearly 550ha of mostly moorland, pasture and woodland to the north and west of Addingham. I have considered specific objections to the inclusion of land at Back Beck Lane and Turner Lane, Addingham under SOM/K/H1/110 and SOM/K/UR5/231 respectively. The present objections are to the generality of including the larger area within the Green Belt.
- 13.5 This swathe of land represents the one large strategic addition to the Green Belt in the RDDP. It follows the Council's Green Belt review prompted by the Inspector's recommendation at the last UDP Inquiry. The general extent of the Green Belt was determined in the approved West Yorkshire Structure Plan of 1980, which describes a Green Belt of varying width around the West Yorkshire conurbation extending to the southern fringe of Addingham. Objections to the failure of the subsequent Wharfedale Green Belt Subject Local Plan to include additional land to the west and north of Addingham were dismissed as not being in conformity with the Structure Plan.
- 13.6 The Council suggests that in the period of over 20 years since the Structure Plan was approved there have been significant changes in the pattern and extent of development pressures. These have included the construction of the Addingham bypass, which has reduced the potential constraints on development to the north and west of the village; the approval and development of significant additional housing to the south and east sides of the village; improved rail services from Ilkley and Steeton into the main urban areas; and the general lengthening of private car commuting journeys.
- 13.7 PPG2 requires exceptional circumstances to exist to necessitate revisions to the Green Belt boundary. In testing this the case of *Copas v Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead* [2001] requires it to be shown that some fundamental assumption, which caused the land to be initially excluded from the Green Belt, is thereafter permanently falsified by a later event. I agree with the Council that the changes listed above that have taken place since the general extent of the Green Belt was fixed have falsified the assumption made by the Secretary of State that Addingham would not expand. I consider that these changes amount to exceptional circumstances. In so far as one objector argues that there have been no significant changes of circumstance since the adoption of the present UDP to justify the Green Belt addition I disagree. I consider that the Council's detailed review of the Green Belt following the last UDP Inspector's recommendation is in itself a significant change of circumstance.

13.8 In my view, the additional land fulfils 3 of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. These are the prevention of further sprawl, the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment, and the stimulation of urban regeneration by the encouragement of the recycling of land through the prevention of development on peripheral greenfield sites. I consider the chosen boundaries to be clear and robust. It is therefore my overall view that the extension to the Green Belt in the manner proposed is justified. No modification to the RDDP is necessary.

### **Recommendation**

13.9 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/GB1.33: West Shaw Lane, Oxenhope**

#### **Objectors**

2221/5803	<i>Mr Derek Allen</i>
2222/5773	<i>Oxenhope Parish Council</i>
4360/9910	<i>Friends of the Earth Yorkshire &amp; Humber</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should remain in the Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.10 This is a somewhat untidy piece of land with an assortment of structures and some open storage. However, it is predominantly open and, although different from the land to the north and west, I consider that it is appropriately included in the Green Belt.

13.11 The present boundary to the Green Belt is clearly defined to the front and side of 76 West Shaw Lane by a wall, and then runs alongside a garage. Whilst this section may be indistinct, this is only because domestic uses have spilled over onto the Green Belt land, and there should be no difficulty identifying the boundary in future by reference to the garage and the rear boundary of the adjoining properties. In my view there are no exceptional circumstances for removing this land from the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

13.12 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of proposal K/GB1.33 and the inclusion of the land at West Shaw Lane, Oxenhope within the Green Belt.**

### **K/GB1.34: North of Leeming Reservoir, Denholme Road, Keighley**

#### **Objectors**

2221/5802	<i>Mr Derek Allen</i>
2222/5775	<i>Oxenhope Parish Council</i>
4360/9912	<i>Friends of the Earth Yorkshire &amp; Humber</i>

### Summary of Objections

- The land should remain in the Green Belt.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.13 This small area of land is enclosed by stone walls, and provides access and parking for the adjoining property. Although open, it is hard-surfaced and is clearly part of the residential curtilage. It is unrelated to the adjoining Green Belt, which comprises the reservoir, and I consider that this is an exceptional circumstance that justifies removing it from the Green Belt.

13.14 The land is also within the Leeming Conservation Area, and any future use of the site would have to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

### Recommendation

13.15 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **K/GB1.35: Sykes Fold, Off Denholme Road, Oxenhope**

#### Objectors

2221/5801	<i>Mr Derek Allen</i>
2222/5776	<i>Oxenhope Parish Council</i>
4360/9911	<i>Friends of the Earth Yorkshire &amp; Humber</i>

### Summary of Objections

- The land should remain in the Green Belt.

### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.16 The objection site comprises a row of cottages and associated gardens, and adjoins other properties forming part of the settlement of Oxenhope. It is clearly an anomaly that this group of buildings was included in the Green Belt, whilst immediately adjoining development was not. In my view this constitutes an exceptional circumstance to justify its removal from the Green Belt.

13.17 The site is also within a conservation area, and any further development would have to preserve or enhance the area's character or appearance.

### Recommendation

13.18 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**K/GB1.53: Yate Lane, Oxenhope**

**Objector**

3736/5184

*Dr Michael Ross*

**Summary of Objection**

- The land should remain outside the Green Belt to allow for the previously permitted extension.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.19 This small triangle of land is the garden associated with the adjoining property to the north. Whilst there is no physical boundary to the land, its extent can be clearly identified by reference to the adjoining buildings. To include this land in the Green Belt would result in an irregular and incongruous boundary, which would be inappropriate in view of the domestic character of the land. In my view there are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration of the Green Belt boundary to include this land.

**Recommendation**

13.20 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the Green Belt designation in respect of land at Yate Lane, Oxenhope.**

**SOM/K/GB1/3: Bolling Road, Ilkley (K/H1.10)**

**Objector**

162/2212

*Mrs Nicola Deakin*

**Summary of Objection**

- The land should be designated as Green Belt.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.21 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H1.10 above.

**Recommendation**

13.22 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/17: Keighley Road/Belton Road, Silsden (K/E1.4)**

**Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.23 I have considered this matter in relation to K.E1.4 above, where I conclude in accordance with the views of these objectors.

### **Recommendation**

**13.24 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the employment allocation and the designation of the land as Green Belt.**

**SOM/K/GB1/18: Sykes Lane, Silsden (K/E1.9)**

### **Objectors**

1757/1976	<i>Mr Eric Bottomley</i>
1764/7705	<i>Mrs Patricia Bottomley</i>
1767/1975	<i>Mr Andrew Craig Bottomley</i>
2487/5291	<i>Mrs D'Arcy</i>
2696/4593	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
3850/7212	<i>Bradford Environmental Action Trust</i>
3946/4748	<i>Mrs Patricia Norris</i>
4032/4710	<i>Mr Keith Norris</i>
4066/4563	<i>Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)</i>
4318/5290	<i>Mr D'Arcy</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be designated as Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.25 I deal with these objections under reference E1.9 above, where I conclude that part of the site should be included within the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

**13.26 My recommendation is given under reference E1.9 above.**

**SOM/K/GB1/19: Leeds Road, Ilkley (K/H1.9)**

### **Objectors**

573/2116	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs John &amp; Dorothy Penwarden</i>
----------	--

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be left as 'Green Belt'.



## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.27 I have considered this objection in relation to K/H1.9, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

13.28 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/GB1/21 & SOM/K/UR5/21: Hainsworth Road, Silsden (K/H2.37)**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be included in the Green Belt.
- The land should be designated as safeguarded land.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.29 As I have indicated earlier in this report, I consider that the majority of the Silsden land not required for development within the plan period should be included in the Green Belt to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. This site comprises an extensive area of open land, which is not required for development either within the plan period, or within the life of the Green Belt, which I have recommended be until at least 2026. It is therefore appropriate that the land be included within the Green Belt. The north-eastern boundary would be the Leeds and Liverpool Canal, which would form a defensible boundary. The western boundary adjoins employment allocations which I am also recommending be deleted, and the land included in the Green Belt.

13.30 There is, however, one part of the site which should not be included within the Green Belt. The north-western section is situated with housing to the north and west, and an employment allocation to the south. The former gas works is previously developed land which is subject to an objection requesting a housing allocation (see above). Its character and surroundings mean that it does not function as Green Belt, forms part of the built up area, and should not form part of the Green Belt. As for the remainder of the north-western part of the site, I do not have detailed evidence regarding the uses and history of this area, or on its possible Green Belt designation. Consequently I do not reach conclusions upon it, or make a recommendation, other than to refer the matter of the Green Belt boundary in this area to the Council.

## **Recommendation**

13.31 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by inclusion of site K/H2.37 within the Green Belt, with the exception of the former gas works. It is for the Council to decide on the Green Belt boundary in the north-western part of the site.**

**SOM/K/GB1/22: Ashlands Road, Ilkley (K/E1.11)**

**Objectors**

573/2112 *Mr & Mrs John & Dorothy Penwarden*  
3235/7918 *Mrs Hilary Myers*

**Summary of Objections**

- The land should be designated as Green Belt rather than allocated for employment use.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.32 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.11 above. The land has not been designated as Green Belt and, being within the built-up area, it does not serve any of the functions of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it.

13.33 I have also considered this site under references SOM/K/OS1/22, SOM/K/OS2/22 and SOM/K/OS3/22 above in relation to allocation as open space

13.34 I conclude that the RDDP appropriately allocates the land for employment use, with provision of some publicly accessible recreational open space, in support of the sustainable development objectives of national, regional and local policy.

**Recommendation**

**13.35 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP except as set out in my recommendation in relation to K/E1.11 above.**

**SOM/K/GB1/24: Woodside Road, Silsden (K/UR5.14)**

**Objectors**

2487/5280 *Mrs D'Arcy*  
3534/7159 *Mrs Maragret Hodgson*  
3537/7160 *Mr Roy Hodgson*  
3705/1983 *Mr J N Shuttleworth*  
3818/4723 *Mr Hughes*  
3899/4769 *Mrs Janet Burgoyne*  
3946/4746 *Mrs Patricia Norris*  
4022/4658 *Mr Clifford Thornton*  
4023/4665 *Mrs Mollie Thornton*  
4024/4675 *Mr Ronald Ellison*  
4025/4679 *Mrs Jean Ellison*  
4032/4712 *Mr Keith Norris*  
4066/4552 *Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)*  
4084/5018 *J and S Mitchell*  
4318/5279 *Mr D'Arcy*

**Summary of Objections**

- The land should be included in the Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.36 I have considered these objections in relation to K/UR5.14 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

13.37 **See my recommendation on K/UR5.14.**

**SOM/K/GB1/25: North Dene Road, Silsden (K/UR5.15)**

### **Objector**

2455/1984 *Mr J C Read*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be included in the Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.38 I have considered this objection in relation to K/UR5.15 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

13.39 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/26 AND SOM/K/GB1/27: Daisy Hill (Centre and East), Silsden (K/H2.5 and K/H2.6)**

### **Objectors**

2455/1986-7 *Mr J C Read*  
3898/3953,3950 *Mr R M Purches*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be included in the Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.40 I consider these objections under reference H2.5/6 above, where I conclude that the land should not be included in the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

13.41 **My recommendation is given under reference H2.5/6 above.**

**SOM/K/GB1/28, SOM/K/UR5/28 & SOM/K/OS2/28: Banklands Avenue (West), Silsden (K/H2.7)**

**SOM/K/GB1/29 & SOM/K/UR5/29: Banklands Avenue (East), Silsden (K/H2.8)**

**Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

**Summary of Objections**

- The land should be included in the Green Belt.
- The land should be designated as safeguarded land.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.42 As I have indicated earlier in this report, I consider that the majority of the Silsden land not required for development within the plan period should be included in the Green Belt to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. These two sites comprise an extensive area of open land, which is not required for development within the plan period. Silsden is a small town in a rural area, and I recommend the allocation of other sites to meet local needs arising after the plan period. Consequently the Banklands Avenue sites are not required as safeguarded land. On the other hand the sites do fulfil Green Belt purposes, by preventing the outward spread of Silsden and protecting the countryside from encroachment. It is therefore appropriate that these sites be included within the Green Belt. The inner edge of the sites generally equates to the limit of current development, which would appear to form a defensible boundary. However, the Council may wish to consider the precise line for a Green Belt boundary in more detail in order to ensure that it relates to recognisable features on the ground. A recreational allocation would not be appropriate as this is agricultural land.

**Recommendation**

13.43 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by inclusion of sites K/H2.7 and K/H2.8 within the Green Belt.**

**SOM/K/GB1/32: Hainsworth Wood Road, Woodhouse, Keighley (K/H2.19 & K/UR5.23)**

**Objector**

2637/2004

*Dr John M Preshaw*

**Summary of Objection**

- This would involve erosion of Green Belt land.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.44 Within the RDDP this site is now split between a housing allocation and safeguarded land. The site is not and never has been included within the Green Belt. I have dealt

more extensively with objections to this land under K/H2.19 and K/UR5.23, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

13.45 **See the recommendations in relation to K/H2.19 and K/UR5.23**

**SOM/K/GB1/33: Spring Gardens Lane, Utley, Keighley (K/H2.20)**

### **Objectors**

2540/4920	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs Carette</i>
2637/2005	<i>Dr John M Preshaw</i>
2932/6895	<i>Mr John Chapman</i>
2971/6902	<i>Mr and Mrs R Danvers</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- Development on the site would lead to a loss of Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.46 Being within the urban form of Keighley the site is not, and never has been, part of the West Yorkshire Green Belt. The land does not serve any of the functions of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it. I have considered other objections relating to this site under K/H2.20 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

13.47 **See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.20.**

**SOM/K/GB1/34: Hollins Lane, Utley, Keighley (K/H2.21)**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The change to safeguarded land does not go far enough. It should be allocated as Green Belt to provide a well-defined boundary and natural end to Keighley.
- The land is too near a busy and dangerous road junction with staggered roundabout and development would lead to increased traffic on the narrow Hollins Lane.
- There are drainage and water problems on the land.
- Development would harm wildlife.
- Designation as Green Belt would prevent urban sprawl and preserve a beautiful meadow.
- Development on the steep hill would be difficult and intrusive.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.48 I have considered objections in respect of this site in relation to K/UR5.24 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

13.49 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/38: Off Lees Lane (North), Haworth (K/H2.31, K/OS7.7 & SOM/K/H1/38)**

### **Objector**

2438/2018 *Mr David Robertson-Brown*

### **Summary of Objection**

- Development on the site would result in the hillside being one large housing estate, out of keeping with Haworth's rural setting and character.
- The land should have Green Belt status.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.50 Within the adopted UDP this site was partially designated as Green Belt. As part of the Council's review of the Green Belt this designation was removed from the site, together with land around Ebor Mill, and was replaced by village greenspace. I have considered objections to this designation and the failure to allocate the land for housing under SOM/K/H1/38. In my view, the site's allocation as village greenspace is correct. This will provide a considerable measure of protection to the land from development, ensuring its continued openness and contribution to the character and amenity of the area, which is what the objector is essentially wanting. I consider no modification to the RDDP to be necessary.

### **Recommendation**

13.51 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/41: Weavers Hill, Haworth (K/H2.35)**

### **Objectors**

361/2032 *Dr Barbara Fawcett*  
461/2033 *Mr Maurice Hanlon*  
1459/3251 *English Heritage*  
1742/3227 *Haworth Parish Council*  
2438/2034 *Mr David Robertson-Brown*  
3123/3273 *Mr Keith C Wilson*  
3814/3822 *Mrs M E Hamer*

## Summary of Objections

- The housing allocation should be deleted and the land re-allocated as a site for recreational use by villagers and tourists. The fields have been used for community events.
- The conservation area boundary should be repositioned to the outside edge of the access road to the car park. Loss of this prominent site would harm the character of the village.
- An extra doctors' surgery could be created.
- Existing access roads are insufficient to meet the needs of the existing population and further housing would exacerbate traffic problems.
- There would be a downturn in tourism, through urbanisation and the loss of a popular area in which to walk and enjoy the agricultural life of the village.
- Brownfield sites should be used instead and facilities would be unsustainable.
- The land should be included within the Green Belt since allocation of the site would result in pressure for the release of further nearby land to the detriment of the landscape setting of this part of Haworth.
- Development would result in an extension into open countryside and would leave the Green Belt without logical or defensible boundaries.
- Development would ruin the rural feel of the tourist parking links to the Parsonage and Church, Penistone Hill Country Park and moors beyond.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.52 The objections relate to the allocation as a phase 2 housing site. Within the RDDP this was changed to a safeguarded land designation. I have considered these and other objections relating to the site under K/H2.35 above, to which reference should be made.

## Recommendation

13.53 **See my recommendation in relation to K/H2.35.**

## SOM/K/GB1/43: Land North of Airedale Hospital, Steeton (OS3)

### Objector

702/5590

*Airedale NHS Trust*

### Summary of Objection

- The land should be deleted as a playing field as it is private hospital-owned land and is not a sports ground as such.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.54 The objection land lies to the north of Airedale Hospital within open countryside, is within the Green Belt and is allocated as a playing field under Policy OS3. It comprises a level grassed area and an adjoining former tennis court whose perimeter fencing is virtually absent and on whose broken surface tipping has taken place. To the south-eastern corner of the land are boarded up changing facilities and a squash court. It is

apparent that the facilities are not currently in use but in terms of advice in PPG17 I consider that it is correct to still regard the land as existing playing fields.

13.55 PPG17 advises local authorities to undertake robust assessments of existing and future needs for open space, sport and recreation to inform local standards. Independent consultants have carried out an assessment of playing pitches, which points to deficiencies both district-wide and within the Keighley constituency area. In terms of the latter there is a deficiency in mini and junior soccer with theoretical deficiencies in provision for cricket and rugby league. There are also no hockey facilities or teams in the area. Assessed against the National Playing Field Association minimum standard there is also a deficiency of provision. PPG17 makes it clear that playing pitches should not be lost unless they are deemed surplus to requirements. There is also a deficiency in provision at the nearby junior school, referred to in connection with K/UR5.4.

13.56 When judged against the above considerations I do not believe the objection land can be regarded as surplus to requirements. The fact that the land is within private control linked to the hospital is in my view no reason why it should not be protected from development under Policy OS3. Paragraph 12.21 of the plan clearly indicates the Council's commitment to the retention of playing fields whether they be Council-run, voluntary or private. I therefore conclude that no modification to the RDDP is warranted.

### **Recommendation**

**13.57 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/68: Baden Street, Haworth (K/UR5.12)**

### **Objectors**

3814/11274                      *Mrs M E Hamer*  
3910/6086                      *Miss Helen E Ferguson*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The safeguarded period should be extended, the land being of ecological value.
- The access road to the land is narrow.
- Health could be adversely affected by building work.
- No further building should be contemplated as all recent development is unsuited to the area.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.58 I have considered these objections in relation to K/UR5.12 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

**13.59 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**



**SOM/K/GB1/70: Belton Road, Silsden (K/E1.5)**

**Objectors**

2487/5292	<i>Mrs D'Arcy</i>
2696/6037	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
3534/7165	<i>Mrs Maragret Hodgson</i>
3914/6043	<i>Mr J Walbank</i>
3946/6053	<i>Mrs Patricia Norris</i>
4032/6048	<i>Mr Keith Norris</i>
4066/6040	<i>Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)</i>
4318/5293	<i>Mr D'Arcy</i>

**Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.60 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.5 above. Development of the site for employment purposes is already fairly far advanced, with some buildings completed and others under construction. Various planning permissions are in existence for the employment development of parts of the site.

13.61 The site no longer satisfies any of the functions of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it. In these circumstances no useful modification to the RDDP is feasible.

**Recommendation**

13.62 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/71: Keighley Road (North), Silsden (K/E1.6)**

**Objectors**

2487/5282	<i>Mrs D'Arcy</i>
2696/6026	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
3946/6036	<i>Mrs Patricia Norris</i>
4032/6034	<i>Mr Keith Norris</i>
4066/6031	<i>Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)</i>
4318/5281	<i>Mr D'Arcy</i>

**Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.63 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.6 above. The site is surrounded by employment uses and allocations and does not serve the functions of the Green Belt or

the purposes of including land within it. Accordingly, I conclude that the land is appropriately allocated for employment and designation as Green Belt is not justified.

### **Recommendation**

**13.64 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/72: Keighley Road (Centre), Silsden (K/E1.7)**

#### **Objectors**

2487/5284	<i>Mrs D'Arcy</i>
2696/6020	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
3946/6025	<i>Mrs Patricia Norris</i>
4032/6022	<i>Mr Keith Norris</i>
4066/6021	<i>Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)</i>
4318/5283	<i>Mr D'Arcy</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The employment allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.65 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.6 and K/E1.7 above, where I conclude that the land does not fulfil any of the functions or purposes of the Green Belt and that the employment allocation is appropriate.

### **Recommendation**

**13.66 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/73: Keighley Road (South), Silsden (K/E1.8)**

#### **Objectors**

2696/5997	<i>Miss Gail Bottomley</i>
3946/6019	<i>Mrs Patricia Norris</i>
4032/6002	<i>Mr Keith Norris</i>
4066/5999	<i>Silsden Town Action Group (STAG)</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be designated as Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.67 I have considered this matter in relation to K/E1.8 above. The site is fully developed and does not fulfil any of the functions or purposes of the Green Belt. Therefore it is not acceptable to designate it as such.

## **Recommendation**

13.68 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/76: Daisy Hill West, Silsden (K/H2.4)**

### **Objector**

3898/5979 *Mr R M Purches*

### **Summary of Objection**

- This site should be included in the Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.69 I consider these objections under reference H2.4 above, where I conclude that the land should not be included in the Green Belt.

## **Recommendation**

13.70 **My recommendation is given under reference H2.4 above.**

**SOM/K/GB1/81: Silsden Eastern Bypass (K/TM20.1)**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land included in the bypass line should be included in the Green Belt instead.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.71 I deal with these objections under reference TM20.1 above, where I conclude that the bypass should be deleted and the land included in the Green Belt.

## **Recommendation**

13.72 **My recommendation is given under reference TM20.1 above.**

**SOM/K/GB1/100: Slates Lane, Curly Hill, Ilkley**

### **Objector**

4199/5592 *Clays Construction*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.73 The objection site comprises a group of detached dwellings fronting onto Curly Hill, Slates Lane and Coppy Wood Drive. The area is identified in the adopted UDP as one where infill development will be permitted.

13.74 This area is separated from the main built-up part of Ilkley by a stretch of woodland. Although only a short distance from the edge of the Green Belt, it appears as a distinct area of built development within the Green Belt and not an extension of Ilkley. Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless there are exceptional circumstances which make it necessary. Whilst this particular area is suburban in character, it is part of the wider Green Belt separating Ilkley from other settlements. PPG2 recognises that there will be areas of development within the Green Belt, and these should be washed over unless further development is envisaged. Whilst there will be a need for housing sites outside the existing built-up areas, these should accord with the Council's location strategy. There is limited potential for additional development in this area, and it is not well located in relation to public transport or local facilities. I do not therefore consider that there are any exceptional circumstances which justify removing this land from the Green Belt.

13.75 The current identification of the area as an infill settlement allows for some development, and Policy GB3 is the equivalent policy in the RDDP. The objector does not ask for the site to be identified under this policy, and I accept the Council's view that it should not be, since this is not a settlement but a detached area of suburban housing, where further consolidation would be inappropriate.

### **Recommendation**

13.76 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/101:                      Rear of 1-17 Woodworth Grove, Ingrow, Keighley**

### **Objector**

677/5593                      *Mrs Karen Smith*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The site should be removed from the Green Belt as the reasons for its inclusion are not clear.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.77 The site is a triangular area of steeply sloping ground comprising, in part, gardens to the rear of houses in Woodworth Grove, and woodland stretching up to Hainworth Lane. The Green Belt boundary is drawn tightly to the rear of Nos. 1 – 17 Woodworth Grove and their domestic garages where the land rises.

13.78 The land is designated as Green Belt within the existing UDP. PPG2 advises that existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless exceptional circumstances exist that make this necessary. Although parts of the land may have been domestic gardens for at least 20 years no reasons have been given by the objector for wishing the Green Belt designation to be lifted from this area. I consider that the land represents an important visual extension of Hainworth Wood to the north across Hainworth Lane and links to the more open farmland to the south. The land is in my view correctly allocated as Green Belt, in particular fulfilling the purposes of preventing the sprawl of this part of Keighley and safeguarding its surrounding countryside from encroachment.

13.79 I do not consider that there are any exceptional circumstances that justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

13.80 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/109: Land at Leeds Road, Ben Rhydding, Ilkley**

### **Objectors**

721/11220	<i>Mr Robert Alfred Tilley</i>
3858/10934	<i>Ilkley Civic Society</i>
4140/5607	<i>Rignet Limited</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- There should be a planning brief for the disused garage, existing caravan storage and industrial units on this site.
- The site should be allocated for showroom, leisure, office, non-food retail or fast food.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.81 I have considered these objections in relation to SOM/CR7/109 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

13.82 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/115: Land at Hollins Bank Lane, Steeton with Eastburn (SOM/K/H1/115)**

### **Objectors**

2468/10085	<i>Estate of the Late Mr and Mrs L Wright</i>
4180/5627	<i>Mr R A Wright</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- Green Belt designation is not appropriate as the land is suitable for residential use and does not extend beyond the current built-up area, being surrounded on 3 sides by residential properties.
- All mains services, schools, rail station and hospital are close by.
- The site has been tidy for 14 years and is of no agricultural use.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.83 The objection land is a small, irregularly shaped field with a frontage to Hollins Bank Lane on the south-eastern edge of Steeton. Within the adopted UDP the land is designated as Green Belt and this is carried forward to the RDDP, following the Council's review of the Green Belt boundary. Being less than a quarter of a hectare in extent the site would be below the threshold used in the plan for the specific allocation of land for residential use.

13.84 The Council considers that the site fulfils the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. I concur with this view. Firstly, the site is situated on rising land above the level of existing dwellings to the immediate west. Being adjacent to Hollins Bank Lane it is prominent from there and its present openness helps to contain the built form of Steeton and prevent it sprawling further up the hillside. Secondly, the site, despite its separation from open land to the south-east by the access drive to properties associated with Bank House Farm, and the presence of adjoining properties, forms part of this broad sweep of countryside. Irrespective of what exists at Bank House Farm development on the site would harmfully encroach into this countryside. I consider the present boundary of the Green Belt is clear and robust and the land is therefore correctly identified as being within it.

13.85 For the boundaries of the Green Belt to be changed there have to be exceptional circumstances to make this necessary. In my view, none of the reasons advanced by the objector for wishing the land to be excluded from the Green Belt amount to such circumstances. Even though the site might be within relatively short distances of some of the facilities and services within Steeton, in general sustainability terms I do not consider it to be particularly well placed. Accordingly, I do not consider any modification to the RDDP to be justified.

### **Recommendation**

13.86 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/238: Land at Bradford Road, Crossflatts, Bingley**

#### **Objector**

4171/10121 *Mr George R Jowett*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for employment use.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.87 I have considered this matter in relation to SOM/K/E1/238 above, where I conclude that the site does not satisfy the purposes and functions of the Green Belt and represents a useful employment site in a strategic location. The Council has accepted that the northern part of the site was previously allocated for employment and this should have been carried over into the RDDP.

### **Recommendation**

**13.88 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site from the Green Belt and that the land be allocated for employment use under Policy E1.**

**SOM/K/GB1/257:                    Howden Road, Silsden (K/OS1.5)**

### **Objectors**

4084/10114                    *J and S Mitchell*

### **Summary of Objection**

- This land should be included in the Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.89 I deal with this site under reference OS1.5 above, where I conclude that the land should be included in the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

**13.90 My recommendation is given under reference OS1.5 above.**

**SOM/K/GB1/320:                    Green Belt Silsden**

### **Objector**

2909/9477                    *Mrs P Spencer*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The scale of planned development in Silsden would not accord with the rules set out in the draft plan.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.91 I consider this very general objection to be satisfied by my recommendations to delete most of the Silsden allocations and add most of the allocated land to the Green Belt.

### **Recommendation**

**13.92 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP additional to those affecting specific objections sites in Silsden.**

**SOM/K/GB1/371: Field No 8284 Shaw Lane, Oxenhope**

**Objector**

1795/10548 *Mr Christopher Holmes*

**Summary of Objection**

- The site should be deleted from the Green Belt.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.93 In my view the existing Green Belt boundary close to the field in question is clear and robust. I concur with the Council's assessment that the Green Belt boundary as drawn to include the field fulfils the Green Belt purposes of preventing the possibility of further sprawl of development and its encroachment into the open countryside, which provides the setting for the village. The objector has advanced no compelling reasons for wishing the field to be excluded from the Green Belt. Given PPG2 advice that existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless justified by exceptional circumstances I consider no such change to be necessary in this case.

**Recommendation**

13.94 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/GB1/384: Land at Lower Naylor Hill Farm, Black Moor Road, Oxenhope**

**Objector**

3702/10933 *Mr Philip H Bland*

**Summary of Objection**

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt to provide a house for a family member.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.95 The objection site comprises a group of farm buildings, including residential accommodation, and surrounding fields. It is set deep within the Green Belt, and satisfies a number of the purposes for including land in Green Belts. PPG2 advises that once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. The personal circumstances described by the objector are not a basis for the removal of land from the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

13.96 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**



## **K/GB6A.1 & SOM/K/GB7/406: Marley Waste Water Treatment Works**

### **Objectors**

4174/11124 & 12631     *Keyland Developments Ltd*  
4365/12831             *Yorkshire Water Services Ltd*

### **Summary of Objections**

- This should be included as a Major Developed Site (MDS).
- The boundary should be amended to identify the full extent of the site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.97 In response to an objection by Keyland Developments Ltd, Policy GB6A relating to major developed sites in the Green Belt was included in the RDDP. This lists a number of water or sewage treatment works, including Marley Waste Water Treatment Works. The original objection by Keyland Developments Ltd has therefore been met, and the only outstanding matter is the area that should be covered by the designation.

13.98 This is a large site, well in excess of the Council's 5-hectare guideline, and it is clearly appropriate that it should be identified as a MDS. The total site area is some 55 hectares, but the area shown on the Proposals Map appears to be somewhat less than half of this. The remainder of the site is generally open. One of the objections suggests that some of the surplus land could be made available for employment purposes. However, Policy GB6A only allows for infilling for the current use within the present extent of development, or redevelopment which would not occupy a larger area of the site than the existing buildings, and would have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It would not allow for additional development, unrelated to the present use. In these circumstances I consider that the boundary should only include the developed part of the site.

### **Recommendation**

13.99 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## **SOM/K/GB6A/404 & SOM/K/GB7/404: Sladen Valley Water Treatment Works**

### **Objectors**

4174/11122             *Keyland Developments Ltd*  
4365/12817             *Yorkshire Water Services Ltd*

### **Summary of Objections**

- This should be included as a Major Developed Site (MDS).

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.100 The objectors state that the size of this site is some 4 hectares, although the Council suggests that it is nearly 6 hectares. However, less than 2 hectares is developed. In my view this is not sufficient to justify its identification as a MDS.

### **Recommendation**

13.101 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/GB6A/410: Low Mills, Old Lane, Addingham**

#### **Objector**

5035/12869                      *Wool Direct Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- This should be identified as a Major Developed Site (MDS).

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.102 This site extends to some 2.6 hectares, but the area occupied by buildings and ancillary development amounts to only about 1.4 hectares. The objector refers to an appeal decision where it was concluded that a site of 3.4 hectares could be considered a MDS, and to a proposal by York City Council to include all sites exceeding 3,000 square metres built footprint as MDSs. There is clearly some variation in the approach taken in different parts of the country, which would affect the assessment. However, I am satisfied that the 5-hectare guideline adopted by the Council is reasonable, together with consideration of the footprint and scale of built development. In this case, although the buildings on this site are substantial, the developed area of 1.4 hectares is too small to justify identification of the site as a MDS.

13.103 The objector and the Council address the suitability of the site for housing, and the effect on the conservation area, but these are not relevant to consideration of whether the site should be identified as a MDS, and I have not therefore considered those representations.

### **Recommendation**

13.104 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/GB6A/424: Oldfield Water Treatment Works, Oldfield, Keighley**

#### **Objector**

4365/12868                      *Yorkshire Water Services Ltd*

## **Summary of Objection**

- This should be included as a Major Developed Site (MDS).

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.105 This site has an overall area of some 3 or 4 hectares, but the developed area is less than 1 hectare. Whilst some of the structures are quite substantial, I consider that the developed area is too small to justify identification as a MDS.

## **Recommendation**

13.106 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.

## Chapter 14 The Natural Environment and Countryside

### **K/NE3.2: Rombalds Ridge, Ilkley**

#### **Objector**

3858/10763 *Ilkley Civic Society*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The name Rombalds Ridge needs clarification, and the area should be specified.
- The Ilkley Moor Management Plan should be adopted as an appendix to the RDDP.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

14.1 I have considered an objection to the name "Rombalds Ridge" in the Policy Framework volume of the report, and I acknowledge that there could be some confusion between Rombalds Moor and the wider area described as Rombalds Ridge. However, this section of the report explains the extent and characteristics of the area in some detail, and I do not consider that any further clarification is needed.

14.2 The Council explains that the Ilkley Moor Management Plan has been produced by the Council in consultation with English Nature, and sets out proposals for managing the Council-owned land on Ilkley Moor, which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). This is not a land use planning document, and I accept the Council's view that it would not be appropriate to include it as an appendix to the RDDP. Nor would it be appropriate to include the identified objectives of the management plan in the text of the RDDP, as these are detailed management matters, and not concerned with land use planning.

#### **Recommendation**

14.3 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

### **SOM/K/NE4/325 & SOM/K/NE12/325: Middleton Woods, Slates Lane, Ilkley**

#### **Objector**

4199/10921 & 10922 *Clays Construction*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- These objections promote the northward expansion of Middleton Woods.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

14.4 There is no indication that the Council has the necessary control over the land, agreement of other parties, if needed, or resources to extend the woodland onto this land. Nor does the objector indicate that a party other than the Council proposes to plant the area. There is no evidence of a suitable development proposal which might include planting. Therefore the expansion of Middleton Woods is not a suitable proposal for the UDP.

- 14.5 The objector does not appear to be suggesting the inclusion of another policy in the plan. Policy NE4 requires developers to contribute to woodland cover in appropriate locations as part of their development proposals.

**Recommendation**

- 14.6 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

## Chapter 15 Natural Resources

### SOM/K/NR5/93: Land at Blackmoor, Oxenhope (K/NR5)

#### Objectors

2221/5795                      *Mr Derek Allen*  
2222/5636                      *Oxenhope Parish Council*

#### Summary of Objections

- Part of this area is highly visible from Oxenhope.
- Mineral extraction would harm wildlife designations, the landscape, tourism, and roads.
- There is doubt about the geological basis for the area of search.
- Extraction would be against the principles of the Green Belt.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 15.1 National policy is that Councils should help to ensure an adequate supply of minerals to meet needs, and should indicate areas for possible future working of minerals. One tool for doing this is by identifying areas of search. The area of search notation at Blackmoor reflects the likely presence of workable minerals. It appears to me to be worthy of further investigation to establish the geology and the viability of extraction, despite the doubts expressed by objectors. I note that quarrying has taken place nearby in the past.
- 15.2 The inclusion of land in an area of search is not the equivalent of a grant of planning permission for mineral extraction. Any application for planning permission would be considered against the relevant policies of the UDP, taking account of the merits of the particular proposal. Thus the matters referred to by objectors would be analysed in detail at that stage. This would include any visual impact, which would be judged on the basis of the characteristics of the proposal, in the context of policies. Much of the land is situated on a plateau and not on the west facing hillside. As for wildlife, there is no evidence that any area of national or greater importance is threatened. The effects on the economy would also be taken into account, including effects on tourism.
- 15.3 National policy says that the extraction of minerals is a temporary activity. Such extraction need not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt: it need not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belts, provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored. It follows that there is no reason in principle why an area of search for minerals should not include Green Belt land. Compliance of individual proposals with Green Belt policy would be investigated in the context of the circumstances and characteristics of those proposals themselves.
- 15.4 Overall I conclude that this area of search notation should remain.

#### Recommendation

- 15.5 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/NR5/94: Naylor Hill, Haworth (K/NR5)**

**Objectors**

2221/5794                      *Mr Derek Allen*  
2222/5635                      *Oxenhope Parish Council*

**Summary of Objections**

- This area is highly visible from Oxenhope.
- Mineral extraction would harm wildlife designations, the landscape, tourism, and roads.
- There is doubt about the geological basis for the area of search.
- Extraction would be against the principles of the Green Belt.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

15.6 National policy is that Councils should help to ensure an adequate supply of minerals to meet needs, and should indicate areas for possible future working of minerals. One tool for doing this is by identifying areas of search. The area of search notation at Naylor Hill reflects the likely presence of workable minerals. It appears to me to be worthy of further investigation to establish the geology and the viability of extraction, despite the doubts expressed by objectors. There is an active quarry within the area of search; it would be preferable to see whether, for example, this would be worthy of extension than to assume that it is not.

15.7 The inclusion of land in an area of search is not the equivalent of a grant of planning permission for mineral extraction. Any application for planning permission would be considered against the relevant policies of the UDP, taking account of the merits of the particular proposal. Thus the matters referred to by objectors would be analysed in detail at that stage. This would include any visual impact, which would be judged on the basis of the characteristics of the proposal, in the context of policies. I have seen that part of the area occupies the break of slope above the Worth Valley, but much of the land is more remote from view. As for wildlife, there is no evidence that any area of national or greater importance is threatened. The effects on the economy would also be taken into account, including effects on tourism.

15.8 National policy says that the extraction of minerals is a temporary activity. Such extraction need not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt: it need not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belts, provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored. It follows that there is no reason in principle why an area of search for minerals should not include Green Belt land. Compliance of individual proposals with Green Belt policy would be investigated in the context of the circumstances and characteristics of those proposals themselves.

15.9 Overall I conclude that this area of search notation should remain.

**Recommendation**

15.10 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

**SOM/K/NR15/238: Land at Bradford Road, Crossflatts, Bingley (SOM/K/E1/238)**

**Objector**

4171/10122

*Mr George R Jowett*

**Summary of Objection**

- The land is not within the washlands and should be allocated for employment use.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

15.11 I have considered this matter in relation to SOM/K/E1/238 above, where I conclude that, due to changes having been brought about in the ground levels, the land can no longer be regarded as being within the washlands. The site is in a strategic location and should be allocated for employment use under Policy E1 of the RDDP.

**Recommendation**

15.12 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the washlands designation and the allocation of the site for employment use under Policy E1.**