

**BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION ONLY**

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council  
Development Services  
4th Floor  
Britannia House  
Hall Ings  
Bradford  
BD11HX

2<sup>nd</sup> January 2024

Dear Sirs,

**ADDITION OF 1 NO APARTMENT (“THE PROPOSALS”) AT ROBIN HILL, CLIFFORD ROAD, ILKLEY, WEST YORKSHIRE (“THE SITE”).**

We hereby submit a full planning application for the Proposals and confirm the requisite application fee has been paid online via the Planning Portal. The following plans, forms and documents are submitted in support of the Proposals in addition to this planning cover letter:

- § Application Forms and Certificates;
- § Site Location Plan; and
- § Submission Plans;
  - Approved Site Plan;
  - Proposed Site Plan;
  - Approved Floorplans;
  - Proposed Floorplans;
  - Approved Elevations;
  - Proposed Elevations; and
  - Approved / Proposed Site Sections;

The above documents collectively address the material considerations and Development Plan policies relating to the development proposals.

**Planning History**

Before assessing the Proposals it is necessary and sensible in this instance to first explore the recent planning history at the Site.

***The Refused Scheme***

In July 2022 planning permission was refused for the demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of nine apartments (“the Refused Scheme”). The reasons for refusal can be summarised as follows:

1. Impact on the character or appearance of the Middleton Conservation Area due to scale and massing;
2. Provision of only 12 parking spaces on site for 9 apartments;

3. Adverse impact on trees; and
4. Potential harm to bats roosting, in the absence of a Roosting Assessment.

Subsequent discussions with Officer's identified that the reasons of refusal could be overcome through a re-submission and further supporting information relating to bats.

### ***The Approved Scheme***

A re-submission followed, proposing a total of six apartments in a smaller redesigned building – notably omitting glazed balconies and reducing their prominence, reducing ridge and eaves heights of all three apartment blocks, and the chimney height and lastly re-orientating the ridge of one block to provide a distinction and avoid a single mass of buildings. Parking provision was increased from 12 to 14 spaces in tandem with the reduction in density – i.e. more than two spaces per dwelling which is above the requisite parking standard.

Additionally, revised / additional detail was submitted in respect of bat roosting and arboricultural matters.

It was accepted that the redesign, reductions to ridge and eaves heights on all three blocks, reducing the height of the chimney, re-orientating the ridge of the roof and removing the glazed balustrading overcame reason for refusal number 1.

It was accepted that the increased provision of car parking coupled with the reduction in density was satisfactory to address reason for refusal number 2.

It was accepted that the additional arboricultural information was sufficient to address reason for refusal number 3.

Lastly, it was accepted that the additional information provided in the bat survey was sufficient to address reason for refusal number 4.

Consequently, planning permission for the *demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of six apartments* ("the Approved Scheme") was approved in August 2023.

### **The Proposals**

The Proposals comprise the incorporation of a single additional apartment at the foot of the approved building. The apartment would be situated at lower ground floor when accessed internally, and open immediately out onto the garden area – i.e. be part subterranean.

The opportunity for a seventh apartment at lower ground level has presented itself post-planning through the detailed design and construction process, and in particular the design of the sub and super structures elements and their interface. The depth of foundations and associated *under-build* is such that a substantial void is created beneath the Approved Scheme between the ground floor level and ground level / reaching foundations. This will result either result in a *stilted* appearance, with the building elevated substantially above surrounding ground levels, or an under build to attach the building to its foundations. Neither of which are desirable in the Conservation Area.

The Proposals involve utilising this void with an additional apartment and a design harmonious with that which sits above it. This is shown on the comparison approved and proposed drawings provided.

It is important to note the following consistencies (“the Consistencies”) between the various elements of the Approved Scheme and the Proposals, namely:

1. The consistency of the footprint and forward projection of the Approved Scheme and Proposals;
2. The consistency in ridge and eaves heights of all components of the Approved Scheme and Proposals;
3. The consistency in overall massing and scale of the Approved Scheme and Proposals;
4. The consistency of the mature landscaped setting of the Approved Scheme and Proposals;
5. The consistent impact on the trees within the Site of the Approved Scheme and Proposals;
6. The consistency of the fenestration of the Approved Scheme and Proposals; and
7. The consistency of the design and materials of the Approved Scheme and Proposals.

With the reasons for refusing the Refused Scheme and the Consistencies in mind, the only material changes are the appearance of the building and the consequential highway considerations of parking and trips to and from the Site associated with the Proposals. These are assessed below.

## **Assessment**

### ***Design and Appearance***

The appearance of the Proposals is identical to the Approved Scheme, save for the additional storey to the foot of the apartment building. As above, this is preferable to the alternatives of a stilted / platformed appearance or a substantial masonry underbuild. The Proposals utilise the same materials, fenestration and design detailing as the Approved Scheme and do not include provision of any additional balustrading which was a concern of Officers’ in dealing with the Approved Scheme. The Proposals will clearly be seen in the context of the Approved Scheme and the elevations shows this to be harmonious, which is not the case with the stilted appearance, or indeed the underbuild. The design and appearance implications are therefore consistent with the Approved Scheme and are acceptable.

Lastly, and for the avoidance of doubt, we can confirm that the Proposals will utilise natural split faced and six-side sawn stone with recess detailing and aluminium fenestration consistent with the Approved Scheme. There are no areas of cladding associated with the Proposals, and in any event, we note the reticence relating to cladding highlighted by Officer’s in approving the Approved Scheme. The intention is to omit any render from the Approved Scheme in totality through the discharge of planning conditions.

### ***Highways***

In terms of highway considerations, there is no discernible increase or change to the trip generation from the Approved Scheme through the addition of one unit. Secondly, the Approved Scheme is in fact over parked by policy standards at more

than two spaces per unit. The Proposals bring the parking back into line with the Development Plan standard of two spaces per unit – i.e. a total of 14 parking spaces for 7 apartments.

### **Summary**

The Proposals are clearly consistent with, and a part of, the Approved Scheme which was clearly deemed to be consistent with the Development Plan and other material considerations. The Proposals should be seen in this context. The Proposals result in very little visible change to the Approved Scheme and in design terms are identical. There are no highways issues associated with the Proposals and there are no other material considerations which should weigh in favour of any other conclusion than that they are consistent with the Development Plan.

The Proposals will not result in any level of harm to the character or appearance of the Middleton Conservation Area, and in any event the clear social benefit associated with the provision of high-quality luxury apartment accommodation for retirees in this part of Ilkley was recognised in determining the Approved Scheme. The Proposals provide additional substance to that conclusion.

We look forward to receiving confirmation that the application is valid and to discussing the Proposals in greater detail in the coming months.

Please note that an application to discharge Condition 13 on the Approved Scheme has already been submitted. Applications to discharge other conditions, including materials, will be submitted in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Mr Matthew Brooke BA (Hons), MA MRTPI  
07968 368892

**For and on behalf of**  
**BANKHEAD**

[info@bankheadgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@bankheadgroup.co.uk)