

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/1</p> <p>UDP - SOM/K/UR4/102 & SOM/K/H1/102</p> <p>Site – Opposite Oak Garth, Cheltenham Avenue, Ben Rhydding, Ilkley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 86-87</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	
<p>SD/K – SD/K/UR/2</p> <p>UDP - SOM/K/UR4/104 & SOM/K/OS7/104</p> <p>Site – Land at Green End Road, East Morton</p> <p>IR – Keighley / Pages 198-199</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	Mod/K/UR/1
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/3</p> <p>UDP – SOM/K/UR4/383 & SOM/K/H1/383</p> <p>Site – Land at Sykes Head, Oakworth</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Page 9</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	Mod/K/UR/2
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/4</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the</p>	<p>Decision : Rejected</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>UDP - K/UR5.1 & SOM/K/GB1/63 & SOM/K/OS7/63</p> <p>Site – Parsons Lane, Addingham</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 9-10 & 197-198</p>	<p>safeguarded land designation K/UR5.1 and the inclusion of the land within the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Reasons :</p> <p>The two key issues covered in paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 of the Inspector's report are whether the land in question should be designated as Green Belt and whether the land should be designated as Safeguarded Land.</p> <p>The Council considers that it is logical to first establish whether there is any case for the site to be added to the Green Belt since the need or otherwise for the land to be safeguarded or allocated for future development should not in itself be a determinant of Green Belt designation and is not one of the five purposes for including land in the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 1.5 of PPG2. It is therefore surprising that the first and more substantive of the two paragraphs of the Inspector's Report deals with the issue of safeguarded land.</p> <p>In paragraph 4.6 the Inspector states that the site is adjoined on three sides by proposed Green Belt. While this is not disputed the Council believes that this is not in itself a sufficient reason for including the land in the Green Belt. The Inspector also considers that the inclusion of the site within the Green Belt would contain the settlement and prevent encroachment into the countryside. While this may be the case, the inclusion of the land within the Green Belt is clearly not <u>necessary</u> to contain the settlement and prevent encroachment into the countryside since the western edge of the site, formed by the A65, would provide an alternative and indeed a much clearer and more robust Green Belt boundary. The presence of this more robust potential boundary would, in the Council's view, leave the land vulnerable to development pressures in the future should the site be included in the Green Belt. This would in the Council's view be in conflict with paragraph 2.8 of PPG2 which states that,</p> <p>'Where detailed Green Belt boundaries have not yet been defined, it is necessary to establish boundaries that will endure. They should be carefully drawn so as not to include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open.'</p> <p>In support of its view that the A65 would form a more robust Green Belt boundary, the Council would also point to the Inspector's conclusions in paragraph 13.8 of the Keighley volume of his report relating to the Green Belt extension at Addingham and boundaries as proposed by the Council. Here he states, '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.'</p> <p>In its evidence to the Inquiry the Council set out its view that the sporadic development of the site and its local topography meant that it bears a stronger</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
		<p>relationship to the built form of Addingham to the east than to the adjacent open countryside. It also considered that this limited any contribution that the site makes to the character and setting of the village. Neither of these key points are mentioned in the Inspector's rather brief paragraph 4.6 and it is therefore not possible to ascertain whether the Inspector agreed with these points and if not, why not.</p> <p>The Council notes that exceptional circumstances are required to add land to green belt and the Courts in a case <i>Copas v The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</i> ([2001] J.P.L. 1169) has led to a very specific test which should to be applied when adding land the green belt. This test provides that exceptional circumstances which necessitate an addition to an adopted Green Belt will not exist unless 'some fundamental assumption which caused the land initially to be excluded from the Green Belt is there after clearly and permanently falsified by a later event'. The Inspector does not appear to have addressed the issue in relation to this objection site, either in paragraph 4.6 or in his consideration of the Council's proposed large scale extension of the Green Belt around the north and west of Addingham at paragraphs 13.4-9, as to whether the addition of this specific site to the Green Belt would meet the Copas test.</p> <p>With regards to the issue of the site's designation as safeguarded land, the Council agrees with the Inspector's comments regarding the strategic role of Addingham, the suggestion that only development to meet local needs should be provided for within the village and that the rUDP identifies two potential sites to met these needs. However the Council does not agree with the Inspector's view that these 2 sites would be sufficient to satisfy local needs both during the plan period and in the longer term for the following reasons. Firstly by specifying in the longer term the Inspector is implying that the 2 sites will be sufficient to meet all development needs - not just housing - well beyond the period covered by the replacement plan. This could amount to an extremely long period of up to 20 years. Secondly the Inspector appears not to have taken account of the fact that the potential for the village to meet its needs in future years will be rather more constrained than at present due the presence of an encircling Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the Inspector's comments concerning the site's location on the edge of the settlement more remote from services than the allocated site at Chapel Street . However it considers that in the future such more centrally located and more sustainable development sites may have been exhausted. Given that the Council considers the land to be inappropriate for inclusion within the Green Belt, its only alternative if the site where not to be safeguarded land would be to leave it unallocated. Leaving the site unallocated would give it less protection and would, subject to the criteria of Policy UR4 make it available for development within the</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
		current plan period when more centrally located sites are available. Finally the Council notes that the site could be used for forms of development other than housing and that even if housing is preferred the Inspector has not ruled out its suitability on noise grounds for such development. The Council therefore maintains that it is this site should be identified as Safeguarded Land.	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/5</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.2 & SOM/K/H1/228</p> <p>Site - Lyon Road, Steeton with Eastburn</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Page 10-11</p>	I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site's safeguarded land designation K/UR5.2.	<p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p>	Mod/K/UR/2
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/6</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.3 & SOM/K/H1/42</p> <p>Site - Sycamore Grove, Steeton with Eastburn</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 11-12 & 81-82</p>	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.	<p>Decision : Accepted</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/7</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.4, SOM/K/H1/234 & SOM/K/CF4/234</p> <p>Site - Main Road, Steeton with Eastburn</p>	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.	<p>Decision : Accepted</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
IR – Keighley, Pages 12-13, Page 105 & Page 180			
SD – SD/K/UR/8 UDP – K/UR5.6 & SOM/K/H1/64: Site - Moss Carr Road, Long Lee, Keighley IR – Keighley, Pages 13-14	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.	Decision : Accepted. Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.	
SD – SD/K/UR/9 UDP – K/UR5.8 & SOM/K/H1/65 Site – Moorlands Avenue, Exley Head, Keighley IR – Keighley, Pages 14 - 16	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP	Decision : Accepted. Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report	
SD – SD/K/UR/10 UDP – K/UR5.9 & SOM/K/H1/66 Site – Keighley Road (North), Bogthorn, Keighley IR – Keighley, Pages 16-17	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.	Decision : Accepted. Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
SD – SD/K/UR/11 UDP – K/UR5.10 & SOM/K/H1/67 Site – Keighley Road (South), Bogthorn IR – Keighley, Pages 17- 18	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.	Decision : Accepted. Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report	
SD – SD/K/UR/12 UDP - K/UR5.11 & SOM/K/H1/236 Site - Keighley Road (West), Bogthorn, Keighley IR – Keighley, Page 18	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.	Decision : Accepted Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.	
SD – SD/K/UR/13 UDP - K/UR5.12 & SOM/K/H1/68 & SOM/K/GB1/68 Site – Baden Street, Haworth IR – Keighley Pages 18- 20 & 214	I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.	Decision : Accepted Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.	
SD – SD/K/UR/14		Decision : Accepted	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector’s Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>UDP - K/UR5.13, SOM/K/H2/69, SOM/K/GB1/69 & SOM/K/OS7/69</p> <p>Site – Denholme Road, Oxenhope</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 20- 22</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Reasons : The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions that the site performs poorly in terms of its sustainability and in terms of the sequential approach to allocating land for housing set out in RPG Policy H2. It also accepts the Inspector’s judgement at paragraph 4.57 that the site contributes to the character and appearance of the area by providing a break in development, bringing the countryside setting right up to the roadside and reinforcing the rural nature of the settlement.</p> <p>However the Council notes and agrees with the Inspector that it would not be appropriate to include the land within the Green Belt and therefore accepts his recommendation to delete the site’s safeguarded land status and afford it protection from development through a designation as Village Greenspace.</p> <p>Policy UR5.13 will therefore be deleted and the Keighley Volume of the UDP and the Proposals Map be amended to show the land’s designation as Village Greenspace.</p>	<p>Mod/K/U R/3</p>
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/15</p> <p>UDP – K/UR5.14, SOM/K/UR5/24, SOM/OS2/24, SOM/K/GB1/24, formerly H2.2.</p> <p>Site – Woodside Road</p> <p>IR – Keighley/Pages 22-23, 34, 117, 189, 208-209.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Decision : Rejected.</p> <p>Reasons : Refer to full Statement of Decision in Appendix 1.</p> <p>The Council rejects the Inspectors decision to allocate this site as green belt and proposes that the site should remain allocated as safeguarded land referenced UR5.14. The inspector has not demonstrated special circumstances to allocate the land as green belt in accordance with the “Copas “principle.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/16</p> <p>UDP – K/UR5.15, Formally K/H2.3, SOM/K/GB1/25</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP. My recommendation is given under reference UR5.15 above.</p>	<p>Decision : The Council accepts the inspector’s recommendations regarding the safeguarded land allocation K/UR5.15.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the inspectors report.</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>Site – North Dene Road, Silsden.</p> <p>IR – Keighley/Pages 24, 117,118, 209</p>			
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/17</p> <p>UDP - UR5.16 (former K/H2.10) & SOM/K/H2/31, SOM/K/OS7/31</p> <p>Site – Wharfe Park, Addingham</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 24-5</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.16</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	Mod/K/UR/4
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/18</p> <p>UDP – UR5.17 (Formerly K/H2.12) SOM/K/OS1/229</p> <p>Site - Higherwood Close, Long Lee, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Page 121</p>	<p>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)</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p>	Mod/K/UR/5
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/19</p> <p>UDP – K/UR5.19 (formerly K/H2.14) & SOM/K/H1/421</p> <p>Site - Moss Carr Road, Long Lee, Keighley</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>IR – Keighley Page 26, 115 & Pages 122-123</p>			
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/20</p> <p>UDP – K/UR5.22 (K/H2.17 and SOM/K/H1/420)</p> <p>Site - Park Lane, Parkwood, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Page 26, 115, 123-4</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p>	<p>Mod/K/U R/6</p>
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/21</p> <p>UDP – K/UR5.23 (formerly part of K/H2.19), SOM/K/UR5/32 & SOM/K/GB1/32</p> <p>Site – Hainworth Wood Road, Woodhouse, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 28 & 210-11</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/22</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.24 K/H2.21, SOM/K/GB1/34, SOM/K/H1/34 SOM/K/GB1/113 SOM/K/H1/113 SITE/K/GB1.2</p> <p>Site - Hollins Lane, Utley, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 28, 77-8, 90-91, 127, 201 & 211-12</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/23</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.25: (formerly K/H2.22) SOM/K/GB1/35 & SOM/K/H1/35</p> <p>Site - Shann Lane, Black Hill, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Page 30, 78 & 127-129</p>	<p>Page 30: 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.</p> <p>Page 129: 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.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	<p>Mod/K/U R/7</p>
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/24</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.26: (formerly K/H2.23) SOM/K/GB1/36 &</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>SOM/K/H1/36</p> <p>Site – North Dean Avenue, Guard House, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 30-31, 78-9 & 129-130</p>			
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/25</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.27 (formerly K/H2.24) SOM/K/H1/37 & SOM/K/UR5/37</p> <p>Site – Occupation Lane (West), Exley Head, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 31-32 & 130-131</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/26</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.28 (formerly K/H2.25) SOM/K/H1/277 & SOM/K/UR5/277</p> <p>Site – Occupation Lane (East), Exley Head, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 32-33 & 130-131</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector’s Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/27</p> <p>UDP – K/UR5.31 (Formerly K/H2.30)</p> <p>Site – Worstead Road, Bocking</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Page 133-4</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s Report.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/28</p> <p>UDP - K/UR5.32: (formerly K/H2.32) SOM/K/H1/39, SOM/K/BH7/39, SOM/K/OS1/39 & SOM/K/OS7/39</p> <p>Site – Off Lees Lane (South), Haworth</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Page 33, 80, 135-137, 172, 184, & 197</p>	<p>Page 33: I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the site’s designation as safeguarded land K/UR5.32.</p> <p>Page137: I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.32.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s Report.</p>	Mod/K/U R/9
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/29</p> <p>UDP - UR5.33 (former K/H2.33) & SOM/K/CF3/78, SOM/K/OS1/78 & SOM/K/OS7/78</p> <p>Site – Ashlar Close, Haworth, Keighley</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation K/UR5.33.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s Report.</p>	Mod/K/U R/10

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
IR – Keighley, Pages 137-8, 178, 184-5 & 198			
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/30</p> <p>UDP - UR5.34 – formerly K/H2.35: SOM/K/BH7/41, SOM/K/CF3/41, SOM/K/OS2/41 & SOM/K/GB1/41</p> <p>Site - Weavers Hill, Haworth, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 139-41, 173, 177, 190-1, 212-3</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted In Part – the Council agrees with the deletion of the site's safeguarded land designation and the need to protect it from development but does not agree with the addition of the recommended addition of land to the Green Belt.</p> <p>Reasons : The Inspector's Report in relation to this site, set out in paragraphs 6.327 to 6.335 covers a number of substantive issues.</p> <p>At paragraph 6.327 the Council notes and agrees with the Inspector's assertion that this site has never been part of the Green Belt. This is a key point which affects the consideration of which designation would be appropriate for the site. The Council returns to this issue in detail below.</p> <p>At paragraph 6.328 the Inspector reaches the conclusion that the site could be genuinely capable of development in the future. The Council agrees with this assessment but notes that simply because a site is capable of being developed does not in itself mean that a site should be identified for development. Other considerations ranging from the detailed issues of the impact of the development on the local area to how the development would accord with local, regional and national strategy for directing development to the most sustainable locations also need to be taken into account.</p> <p>In paragraph 3.329 the Inspector concludes that in locational terms Haworth is classified in the Replacement Plan as a less well located settlement. The Council agrees with this assessment. It follows that the Plan should only be identifying sufficient land – both for the plan period through allocations, and for the longer term through the identification of safeguarded land – to meet local housing need.</p> <p>Having established the importance of providing for these local housing needs, the remainder of the Inspector's deliberations, covering paragraphs 6.331 to 6.335 assess the potential impacts of development of the site on the character and setting of the village and in particular its conservation area. At the inquiry the Council took the view that assuming high standards of design, the development of the site need not have an adverse impact on the setting of the conservation area. This possibility has been considered by the Inspector and rejected. The Council therefore accepts the Inspector's conclusion that the open setting of the fields adjoining the car park greatly contributes to the special interest and character of the village and that that this would be lost in part by the development irrespective of the form or quality of</p>	Mod/K/UR/11

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
		<p>what could be built. It therefore follows that the Inspector's conclusion that the site should not be identified as safeguarded land is logical and this conclusion is therefore also accepted.</p> <p>The Council, however, does not consider that the Inspector has made an adequate or compelling case for the addition of the site to the Green Belt. The Council has reached this view by reference to the tests set out both in national planning policy and established in law. In order for land to be added to the Green Belt exceptional circumstances must exist. This is in line with the general principle set out in paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 that 'Once the general extent of the Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances.' The Inspector sets out, at paragraph 6.333 a number of issues which he considers represent 'good reasons' why the majority of the site should be included within the Green Belt. However good reasons for making such a change do not necessarily represent 'exceptional circumstances' - demonstrating exceptional circumstances is in the Council's view is a far more rigorous test. The Council therefore considers that the analysis in paragraph 6.333 does not set out a convincing basis for adding the land to the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Inspector does state at Paragraph 6.334 that he considers that exceptional circumstances exist for adding land to the Green Belt. However he makes no mention of what these circumstances are in this specific case. He merely refers to his comments in the Policy Framework of his report. Given that the Inspector does not give a specific reference to where this assessment in the Policy Framework occurs, the Council can only presume that he is referring to pages 9-12 which deal with Policy UDP2. The analysis in this part of his report does consider the general extent of the Green Belt but makes no specific mention of this site or the issues which could potentially lead to its addition to the Green Belt. The general thrust of pages 9-12 is to call for a further general green belt review and deletion of currently designated green belt land on the basis of a presumed deficiency of phase 2 housing land and safeguarded land. Notwithstanding the fact that the Council does not agree with the Inspector's conclusions on the need for an immediate further green belt review (as set out in the Council's Statement number SDxxxx), this argument does not appear to relate to the issues relevant to this site.</p> <p>The Courts in a case Copas v The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead ([2001] J.P.L. 1169) has led to a very specific test which should be applied when adding land the green belt. This test provides that exceptional circumstances which necessitate an addition to an adopted Green Belt will not exist unless 'some fundamental assumption which caused the land initially to be excluded from the Green Belt is thereafter clearly and permanently falsified by a later event'. The</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
		<p>Inspector makes no mention of whether or how this test is met in relation to the land at Weavers Hill. There is therefore no basis on which to include the modification to the green belt as recommended by the Inspector. Moreover it is the Council's view that there are convincing reasons to suggest that the Copas tests cannot be met in this case. This is firstly because any policy changes – whether local, regional, or national – cannot be considered to be permanent changes of circumstance, and secondly because it is doubtful whether there have been any significant changes since the Green Belt in this area was first defined and the land in question was left out of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Given that the Council accepts that the site cannot be developed without some harm to the character of the area, and its conclusion that one of the potential means of protecting it – through green belt designation – is not appropriate, another form of designation which would prevent development is necessary. Paragraph 12.42 of the Policy Framework volume of the Replacement UDP states that, <i>“There are some other areas of greenspace which have an important local amenity value, contributing to the character and setting of the village. Development of these areas, some of which may be privately owned or include areas of Recreation Open Space, would be harmful to the visual, quality, character and setting of the village.”</i></p> <p>It is the Council's view that the land to the west of Weavers Hill meets this description and would therefore be most appropriately designated as Village Greenspace. While not representing the level of protection or permanence of protection afforded by Green Belt, this designation would recognize many of the attributes of the land as described by the Inspector and the contribution the Inspector considers it makes to the setting of the village. Policy OS7 would give the land robust protection for the lifetime of the Plan whilst providing a degree of flexibility in the much longer term should a future Plan review find the need for land to meet local development needs so overwhelming and the options for meeting that need to be so constrained as to outweigh the harm to the setting of the village which development would bring.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/31</p> <p>UDP - SOM/K/UR5/107, SOM/K/H1/107, SOM/K/H2/107 & SOM/K/GB1/107:</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : The Council accepts the recommendation though it does not fully accept the reasoning given by the Inspector in paragraph 4.121 of his report. In particular it considers that the Council's review of the Green Belt as part of the preparation of this plan is not in itself an exceptional circumstance which justifies a</p>	<p>Mod/K/UR/12</p>

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>Site - Land at Crossfield Road, Oxenhope</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 35-36</p>		<p>green belt deletion.</p> <p>However in paragraphs 3.19 and 3.20 of his report into the Policy Framework volume of the Plan, the Inspector does point out the two main exceptional circumstances which could justify Green Belt deletions. These are firstly the removal of land to meet the district's development needs and secondly to remove anomalies in the original delineation of Green Belt boundaries or anomalies which have arisen since the boundaries were first defined. The latter circumstance applies in this instance as it is clearly – as implied by the Inspector in paragraph 4.121 – an anomaly that the Green Belt boundary in this location has been drawn to exclude the curtilages of all the other properties along the south side of Crossfield Road but not that of number 23.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/32</p> <p>UDP - SOM/K/UR5/231 & SOM/K/H1/231: (Part of K/GB1.4)</p> <p>Site – Land at Turner Lane, Addingham</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Pages 36-37</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted</p> <p>Reasons : The Council agrees with the Inspector's conclusion at paragraph 4.124 that the 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.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/33</p> <p>UDP – SOM/K/UR5/233, SOM/K/H1/233, SOM/K/H2/233 and SOM/K/GB1/233</p> <p>Site - Land to west of Carr Bank, Riddlesden</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Page 37</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Decision : Accepted.</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/34</p>		<p>Decision : Accept</p>	

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Keighley Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p>UDP – SOM/K/UR5/382 & SOM/K/GB1/382</p> <p>Site – Field No. 411, Wheathead Lane, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley / Page 38-39</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p>Reasons : The Inspector concludes that the presently defined Green Belt boundaries are clear and robust, and that the land fulfils Green Belt purposes. The Inspector also concludes that the site does not perform well in terms of sustainability, the sequential approach in RPG and advice in PPG3 regarding the allocation of housing land.</p> <p>For these reasons the Council accepts the Inspector's Recommendation.</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/35</p> <p>UDP - SOM/K/UR7/105.01, SOM/K/E6/105.01 & SOM/K/CF6/105.01</p> <p>Site - Premises at Bradford Street, Keighley</p> <p>IR – Keighley Proposals Pages 40 - 41</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP</p>	<p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report</p>	
<p>SD – SD/K/UR/36</p> <p>UDP – SOM/K/UR7/380</p> <p>Site – Land south of the canal, Silsden</p> <p>IR – Keighley, Proposals Page 41</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p>	