

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SILSDEN TOWN COUNCIL FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY THE 20th November 2025

Present: Cllrs Naylor, Walton, Davis, Jessup, O'Dwyer, R Whitaker, Wogden, Russell, Smith and Ford. Public [2]

Cllr Walton in the chair

1. Apologies for absence were received from C Whitaker
2. Accepted the reason for apologies
3. Agreed minutes of the planning meeting held on the 17th October 2025
4. Public adjournment - None requested
5. Comments on the proposal within CBMDC budget consultation that BMDC is to pay the precept to Parish and Town Councils in two stages, rather than at the beginning of the municipal year. STC raise objections to this proposal on the following grounds insufficient notice and total lack of consultation to change 'common practice' since precepts were introduced. The proposed change will adversely affect Silsden and its residents because our budget strategy for next year has been set following extensive work and the timescales resulting from a CBMDC decision will be too late for the coming year as our budget has to be set in advance to meet CBMDC timescales for submission of precept. STC has become a grant funding council and is approached in the first half of the year by organisations requiring support for many activities which could put the STC in the position of not being able to fund them, with the majority of organisations that we support are offering services to the residents where Bradford have withdrawn them on previous cost cutting exercises. Other grant funding requests are made to enable organisations to plan and commit to expenditure for activities in the first half of the year which are not supported by Bradford; the lack of time given by this proposed change could cause some activities to be cancelled as they can only take place in the first half of the year.
6. To comment on the following planning applications
25/04151/HOU First floor window to front elevation 3 Weatherhead Place Silsden Keighley West Yorkshire BD20 0JE – No objection
25/04152/HOU Two storey rear extension 24 Jennings Close Silsden Keighley West Yorkshire BD20 0QN – No objection
25/03876/FUL Change of use of existing stable building and adjacent equestrian storage building to create a three bedrooomed residential dwelling Manor House Farm Bolton Road Silsden Keighley West Yorkshire BD20 0FW – objection on the grounds that the original planning for the stables [21/05217/ful] was granted with the condition [5] that the stable The stable building hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the occupation and use of Manor House Farm as stated in the supporting statement by Rural Solutions dated 30 September 2021. Our original comments clearly stated that the development should not be converted in to a dwelling at a later date. Application for dwelling we now consider overdevelopment in green belt.
25/03628/FUL Construction of 3 dwellings Land Adjacent To Persimmon Homes Site Bolton Road Silsden BD20 9FR – Objections on the following grounds and a request for the application to be heard by panel as per the planning protocol has

been made. STC object on the grounds that this is a piecemeal development and prevents holistic overview of the housing developments in Silsden. A disproportionate amount of new housing has been and is currently being built in Silsden. The works themselves cause constant disruption and inconvenience to local residents and the ever increasing number of houses is not matched by the necessary increase in provision for public facilities in the town. This is leading to a diminished quality of life for residents.

The failure of Bradford Council to implement an updated Local Plan means that Silsden is near the point of providing all the proposed current allocation of new houses, but based on a 20 year old plan for where they should be located. This application has the potential to 'open the gates' for further unsustainable development.

The application relies on a vehicle access from Bolton Road which is currently being constructed by Persimmons to serve their adjacent approved site for 138 dwellings. Vehicle access was a major consideration in that approval, yet no reference is made in this current application to the suitability of adding further vehicle traffic to the Bolton Road access. A full study is needed.

Large water attenuation tanks were designed and approved for the Persimmon development. This was in recognition of the ever pressing issue of surface water drainage and the failure of the water company to prevent foul waste pollution of our watercourses. This proposal adds more load to this failing system yet there is no recognition of this in terms of its impact or a mitigating design.

There are a number of significant trees on the site perimeter. The application red line carefully avoids these trees so as to exclude them from consideration in the application. This is disingenuous since it is obvious that the 'retained' areas containing these trees would never be managed separately from the application site. Regardless of the alignment of the application red line these trees should be fully included in the consideration of the application. To this effect a new appropriate arboriculture impact assessment should be made rather than a reliance on a four year old survey carried out for the adjacent development.

The above comment applies equally to the biodiversity and environmental submissions which are wholly inadequate. By equal measure there should be due consideration of the landscape impact once the trees are taking into account.

The Local Plan, guiding the nature and location of development in Silsden, was adopted 20 years ago. Clearly it is wildly out of date. Even the draft for its replacement is no longer current, having most recently been issued nearly 5 years ago. Hundreds of new houses have been built since then, effectively without a meaningful adopted plan. Bradford Council chose to play down to the significance of the emerging plan when considering the Persimmon application in 2023. Two years on, and many new houses later, it is high time that things are brought up to date, with the assumption that applications such as this cannot be determined except by reference to an updated plan. Had the local plan been progressed as it should have been, the Persimmon application would have been refused.

The Persimmon approval did at least include some area identified in the draft local plan as potential housing. This application is outside that area. Furthermore it represents a significant encroachment on the land between the previously approved site and the hamlets of Swartha and Brunthwaite. Hundreds of objectors have expressed their deep concern about the loss of these fields and the footpaths they contained. The valued nature of the local landscape has already been degraded and any possible further erosion of the remaining openness would be heartbreaking to many people, particularly knowing that a democratic deficit in our local planning procedures allows it to take place.

The National Planning Policy Framework refers to such situations where there is no up to date development plan. It suggests that there should be no presumption in favour of development where the 'impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole'

We consider that proposals would have a demonstrably negative impact given the dangerous precedent that an approval would set for the remaining open areas.

7. Agreed date for the next planning meeting for January 2026 as the 22nd

.....
Chair 22.1.26