

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SILSDEN TOWN COUNCIL'S PLANNING COMMITTEE. HELD HALL ON THURSDAY THE 18th April 2013

Commenced 7.30pm

Concluded 9.30pm

Present: Cllrs Jump, Bell-Jump, O'Dwyer, Robinson, K Conway, A Conway, Huggins, Savage and Atkinson. Andrew Smith - Habisit, Mark Taylforth - Pendle Projects, Public [4]

Cllr Huggins in the chair

1. Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr Croft
2. No declaration of interest on items on the agenda.
3. Public Adjournment – taken the council were updated on the habisit food store project and a planning application is expected end of May time. Public comment was made in objection to the Town Hall planning application.
4. Minutes of the last meeting 21/3/13 were signed as true.
5. To comment on the following applications:

13/01228/HOU | Demolition of recent extension to listed building and addition of new rear annex | **Town Head Farm** North Street Silsden West Yorkshire BD20 9PP- no objection on the annex works however objection on any alternation or removal of the garden wall as this is part of the listed building.

13/00459/FUL | Alterations to front entrance and re-installation of escape stairs to rear | **Town Hall** Kirkgate Silsden West Yorkshire BD20 0PB – the following objection letter was agreed proposed by Cllr Bell-Jump, seconded by Cllr Atkinson will all councillors in favour:

FRONT

We agree with highways regulations that the pavement should be a width of 1.5m throughout the length of the ramp to the steps . It would appear from the plans that there is NOT a uniformed 1.5m distance throughout.

There are no safety measures on the step end, nothing to indicate to partially sighted the steps are there, therefore not DDA compliant.

MATERIALS

The plan is totally silent on the materials to be used, therefore in order to be able to comment on them, which is a pertinent planning concern, please explain what they are.

Doorway – are these changing in order to be DDA compliant or are they being kept in order to comply with the current conservation policy – again details required in order for a full consultation to be feasible

CONSERVATION

There seems to be a lack of general detail on how this application would fulfil the requirements of the conservation area policy and we request details as to how the proposed changes fit in with said policy

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Given that there is an oil tank and gas meter and fixtures in the cellar we see no provision for ventilation as it appears the ramp as proposed will cover and prevent the current ventilation.

INTERNAL

The route to use the fire escape through the kitchen would require assess down at least 2 steps. The route through the kitchen its self surely cannot comply with fire regulations for a public building as a kitchen is always classed as the most probable site of a fire where on exists. Bradford Council's Heritage impact statement says **Of paramount importance is the necessity to guarantee the safe and adequate ingress and exit from the building of all who are likely to use it.** The design does not comply with this – exiting the building by the downstairs fire escape does not comply with the

minimum need for 1.5m turning circle for wheelchairs as is reflected in the front of the building plans.

BACK FIRE ESCAPE

Assuming there was to be an emergency during a production with the max 200 capacity and an evacuation is required and use the back fire escape is in play the area of land and space available for movement is not large enough and will cause a delay in evacuation there will also be a bottle neck when meeting the route from the alternative fire escape with a high risk of crush, there is no space to pass a wheelchair and obstacles may also cause delay.

We see no evidence of a legal agreement that gives access out in perpetuity, to guarantee the way out is clear at all possible times, as at the moment the access is locked to the rear of the Skipton Building Society. This agreement must include all the properties that front Kirkgate [57, 59, 61, 63, 65, and 67] and the associated flats above and that the area must be clear at ALL times.

We query where the siting of the refuse bins. Where will these be as choice limited due to the narrowness of this proposed access/escape route.

The description on the application states DDA compliance; officer's reports in this application so far confirm that this is not DDA compliant. Please advise what regulations exist that have to be complied with both in planning and building regs.

.....

These concerns are raised on the information that we have to hand, but we reserve our right to comment further once the full information is in the public domain and notified. We still require sight of:

- Cross sectional information on the ramp
- Correct dimensions and different ones shown on different plans
- Full information as regards to the material to be used and confirmation for like for like such as the marble steps already in situ
- Confirmation of the correct plans to be used as plans on the web site are different to plans consulted on at the public meeting and also original plans sent to the Town Council.

Give the number and seriousness of the objections so far, should Bradford be of mind to approve this application this Town Council request that it goes before panel. We would also like you confirm which panel it will go before, area or regulatory given that this is in fact an internal application.

13/01246/HOU | Conservatory to side | **2 Jennings Close** Silsden West Yorkshire BD20 0QN – No objections

6. Confirmed that date of the next meeting as 16th May 2013.

.....
Chair 16/5/13