

## Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday 23 July 2014 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

---

Commenced 1000  
Adjourned 1107  
Reconvened 1107  
Concluded 1317

### PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	THE INDEPENDENTS
Ellis	Lee (Chair)	Naylor
Sykes	Abid Hussain (DCh)	
	Ross-Shaw	
	M Slater	

Observer: Councillors B M Smith (Minute 21) Poulson (Minute 22)

Apologies: Councillors Barker, Brown and Farley

### Councillor Lee in the Chair

#### 18. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Abid Hussain disclosed an interest in Minute 27 in the interests of clarity as he knew the applicant as a shop owner.

#### 19. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents.



## 20. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.

## 21. 24 PARISH GHYLL ROAD, ILKLEY

### Ilkley

Full planning application for the construction of a single dwelling at 24 Parish Ghyll Road, Ilkley – 14/00559/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Ilkley Parish Council had recommended refusal and there were objections from a Ward Councillor plus 18 individual addresses and from Ilkley Civic Society. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “C”.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of its impact on the amenity of occupiers of adjoining land, traffic safety and the character of the surrounding area. It was considered to accord with the provisions of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2005) for the Bradford District and relevant Policies BH7, NE5, NE6, UR3, D1, TM19A and TM12 and with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to the conditions as outlined in Document “C”.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- I was concerned about this application in 2013 and I was surprised that it was re-submitted with only a small reduction in size.
- The proposed development would lead to overcrowding.
- Additional traffic would be generated by the proposal and I am concerned about the traffic assessment.
- Access to emergency vehicles would be impossible.
- The proposed development was out of keeping with the surrounding area.
- There was a clash here as the appeal was still to be determined.
- It was an inappropriate development within the conservation area.
- This application should be refused or deferred for a traffic assessment.

A Parish Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- The proposed development was located in a conservation area.
- There were traditional Victorian stone buildings in the area.
- There were small well maintained gardens on this road.
- The original features had been retained.
- A previous application had been refused and nothing had changed.

- It was not the right time or the right place for this application.
- It was not the correct place to squeeze in a dwelling in a garden in a conservation area.
- The proposed development would do nothing to enhance the area and would have a harmful effect on neighbouring properties.
- The application was not in accordance with planning policies.
- The proposed development would damage the existing enjoyment of residents.
- Neighbouring households would be deprived of the privacy of their gardens.
- The dwelling would be constructed in the middle of a series of private gardens.
- This proposal would destroy the quality of life for persons in adjacent properties.
- This application goes against core planning principles.
- The Localism Act 2011 should be taken into account as residents would be adversely impacted by this application.
- The proposal was out of character with adjacent properties.
- Dwellings on other roads would also be affected by this application.
- Parish Ghyll Road was already double parked.

There was a letter of objection from another Ward Councillor saying that her stance remained the same and that there would be increased congestion and that the development was an inappropriate design and the materials were not suitable.

An objector was present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- My garden was along the whole length of the street and I have been asked to speak by all the other residents.
- Other residents have apologised as they would have liked to attend the meeting but can't due to holiday and work commitments.
- The Panel has previously rejected this application and nothing has changed.
- The Star Trek design was not appropriate.
- There were 32 objections.
- The site was an area of calm in the centre of Ilkley and 16 households benefited from this area.
- The development would spoil the peace and quiet of this area.
- The proposed house would be built along our gardens.
- The garden for a six bed family house would be considerably smaller than for other 5 bedroom houses.
- It was currently possible to enter and leave the site.
- There were a number of inaccuracies in the planning proposals.
- Boundaries have been changed.
- The proposal was similar to a previous proposal, please reject this proposal.

Another objector confirmed that she supported what had been said by the previous objector and that she was against 'garden grabbing' and that there was not much off street parking.

The agent for the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- There were discussions at the moment in respect of changes to the boundary and some garden space may be taken.
- In the original design there was a big green area and the whole ethos of the development was to maintain green space in the area.
- It was intended to create a home to live in and to minimise impact on neighbours.
- Previous refusal of the application was due to scale an appearance in the conservation area and there had now been a 12% reduction in the floor area.
- My client lives at number 24 Parish Ghyll and wants to build a house in a beautiful green area.
- This application deals sensitively with all issues raised in respect of this proposed building being built in a conservation area.
- There was a large turning area.

Members made the following comments:

- A previously refused application was been appealed against. Was this twin tracking?
- Which takes precedent the appeal or the application?
- How do we stand with the conditions?
- How visible would the development be on the street scene?
- The design was modern and looks like the previous application and would contrast with the surroundings in an obtrusive way.
- What would be the highways impact of the proposal be?
- How does changes in the boundary impact on the plans?
- The previous refusal was spot on.
- A reduction of 12% was not a material issue and I am concerned about any boundary issues.
- The application should be refused as the design was not in keeping with properties in the surrounding area.
- I am happy with the modern design but not in this area.
- This application was not much different to the previous application.
- I would go along with a refusal due to same reason as previous refusal.

The Council's legal representative responded to members' comments and made the following points:

- It was not twin tracking and an appeal can run at the same time that an application was considered. Neither takes precedent and both would be determined on their own merits.
- The recommended conditions were the same.
- There might be some concern about the general arrangement of space and the Panel could defer consideration of this application to address this issue.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture responded to Members' comments and made the following points:

- In the event that the Planning Inspector was minded to uphold the appeal, he/she would be asked by Planning Officers to impose the same conditions recommended in the report.
- The application was previously refused due to its design in a conservation area.
- It would be slightly visible from outside.
- Any increase in traffic would be minor and within the capacity of the highway.
- Boundary changes were a private matter.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be refused for the following reason:**

**The scale and design of the proposed dwelling is not in keeping with the character or appearance of this part of the Ilkley Conservation Area and it is contrary to Policies BH7 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture***

## **22. BROCKLEIGH MILL HILL, HAWORTH, KEIGHLEY**

### **Worth Valley**

Householder application for increase to roof pitch to form first floor extensions at Brockleigh, Mill Hill, Haworth, Keighley – 14/01399/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals. He reported that the Parish Council had objected to the proposal. Six letters of objection were received along with a representation on behalf of neighbours by a Ward Councillor. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "C".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the proposed extension was considered to relate satisfactorily to the character of the existing dwelling, adjacent properties, the setting of nearby listed buildings and the Haworth Conservation Area. The impact of the extension upon the occupants of neighbouring properties had been assessed and it was considered that it would not have a significantly adverse effect upon their residential amenity. As such this proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policies BH7, BH4A, D1, UR3 and D5 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, the Householder Supplementary Planning Document and form sustainable development compatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to the conditions as outlined in Document "C".

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- I object to this application as the building was near some Grade 2 listed cottages.
- A precedent has already been set on this site through the previous permission.
- There was already overshadowing and it would get worse as the trees would not always be there.
- There would be a negative impact on drainage.

A Parish Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- We have been discussing drainage issues in Haworth and it was a big problem.
- Was there a tree preservation order?
- We are objecting to the pitch of the roof.

The applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- A previous application for this proposal was approved and this new scheme only proposed changes to that scheme.
- This was an older property that needed repairing.
- It was necessary to take the canopy across the bay window as it was leaking.
- Minor changes were proposed which would not change the footprint of the property.
- The objections don't relate to the changes being made in this proposal but to the original application.
- It was a 1930's bungalow and we are trying to make it viable.
- This was not a big scheme and I hope it was acceptable.

Members made the following comments:

- There was a site visit last time and the structural engineer had checked the wall.
- The trees were not coming down.
- Do we have to ask for a TPO? Can we condition it?
- All trees are protected in a conservation area.
- Where does this application sit with permitted development?

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture responded to Members' comments and made the following points:

- The conservation area gave a level of protection for the trees.
- You can't impose a TPO by condition.
- The trees are protecting the environment.
- A planning application had previously been granted and this new application was a variation to that.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions as set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture’s technical report (Document “C”).**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture***

**23. EXHIBITION BUILDING, EXHIBITION ROAD, SALTAIRE, SHIPLEY**

**Shipley**

Full planning application for the demolition of 4 greenhouses, shed and boiler house. With the construction of a high needs vocational centre and greenhouse with associated landscaping including reconfiguration of access and external social space and landscaping. Exhibition Building, Exhibition Road, Saltaire, Shipley – 14/01137/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that letters of representation objecting to the proposals were received from 129 separate addresses and letters of representation supporting the proposals were received from 15 addresses. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “C”.

There had been a request from the Environmental Health Service for an additional condition in respect of monitoring of any possible contamination on the site and of the materials brought onto the site.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the proposed new building for a ‘High Needs Vocational Centre’ within the Buffer Zone of the World Heritage Site and in the Conservation Area was acceptable in principle. The proposed new building was set into the ground and the current landscaping around the edge of the site was being retained in order to screen and soften the visual impacts of the proposed building. The materials are in keeping with the palette of materials present in the surrounding area and the design was influenced from the local distinctiveness of the World Heritage Site. The design was contemporary and does not create a pastiche or attempt to copy the surrounding built form. The proposed building was considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupants. There would be some loss of open space but the remaining land would be landscaped and made accessible for the benefit of the students. The site has never been available for general public use and therefore there would be no loss of public open space to the residents of Saltaire. The additional number of students would not lead to a substantial increase in traffic and the coach ‘drop off’ bay had been retained in its current location. The proposal was considered to accord with policies UR3, D1, BH14, BH7, BH4A, UDP3, D5, TM19A and TM11 of the RUDP and consequently requirements of the NPPF. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to the conditions as outlined in Document “C”.

A late consultation was reported within which the Council's Environmental Protection Officer had proposed some additional conditions to safeguard against contaminated material being found on the site during the build.

An objector was present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- I live in Saltaire.
- There were 204 members on Facebook objecting to this application.
- This area was a world heritage buffer zone area.
- This application sets a dangerous precedent as we can't stop other modern buildings in the buffer area.
- There would be a loss of open space. There was not a lot of open space in Saltaire.
- In some streets there are no gardens.
- There should be an archaeological investigation as a statue was found before in a Japanese garden.
- The College has not tried other options.
- English Heritage doesn't support use of the site.

A second objector was present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- The site has always been open space.
- Development has previously been avoided on the site. It was spared by mill owners due to it's symmetry to Salt's Mill.

The Principal of Shipley College was at the meeting and made the following points:

- £1.1 million would be spent refurbishing the exhibition building.
- There would be improved facilities for those who have special needs.
- It was necessary to complete the work by March 2015 otherwise funding would be lost.
- There was a shortage of places for 15 to 20 year olds.
- It was disappointing that some of our neighbours were not supportive.
- Students would be helped to develop themselves.
- It was necessary to protect the College in an atmosphere of cuts.

The agent for the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- It was a good design and had been subject to pre-application discussion.
- The World Heritage Site Officer, English Heritage and planning officers supported this application.
- The building would contribute to the value of Saltaire.
- It was an eco-quality building.
- The area was not identified as a key open space.
- The materials were not cheap.
- There would be natural daylight and thermal efficiency.



- Trees of quality would be planted on the site.
- We are happy with the conditions.
- Please grant planning permission.

Members made the following comments:

- It was stated that that surface water would be reduced by 30%.
- Were design options restrained by costs?
- This was a new look for the conservation area.
- English Heritage was concerned about the original design and was now in favour of the application.
- Just putting a grass roof on was not enhancing the architecture. It would soon lose its pristine look as they can soon become unkempt and the building was adjacent to a world heritage site.
- This was proposing a flat roof in an area of pitched roofs.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture responded to Members' comments and made the following points:

- Recycled water would be made use of.
- There was a standard drainage condition included.
- Quality materials would be used.
- This type of roof was a modern approach and would have drainage benefits.
- There would be carbon benefits to the roof as it would soak in water.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions as set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture's technical report (Document "C") and subject to additional environmental health conditions.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture***

#### **24. HOLMFIELD, MANOR ROAD, KEIGHLEY**

#### **Keighley Central**

Full planning application for construction of 4 x four bedroom detached dwellings with integral garages, gardens and demolition of existing garages to form new private driveway access at Holmfield, Manor Road, Keighley – 13/04890/FUL.

Following the officer presentation and questions from Members at the 9 April 2014 Keighley and Shipley Area Planning Panel, the consideration of this application was deferred with a request that the applicant submit fuller details of surface water drainage arrangements for the development. This was to specifically include an investigation of the likelihood of springs and ground water within the site and in the adjoining open field,

together with submission of proposals to adequately deal with any springs or ground water that might be encountered in the course of excavation and development so as to avoid flood risk to adjoining properties.

The applicants had submitted further drainage information.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that 16 representations were received, of which 15 were objections. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "C".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that it had been assessed that the development would retain the open character of the urban green space and through retention of significant trees make a positive contribution to the character and amenity of the area whilst also contributing to the provision of sustainable residential development in the District. The proposal has also been assessed as not adversely affecting the setting of the Devonshire Park Conservation Area, residential amenity, parking, highway safety and drainage or community safety. As such it was considered that the proposal would accord with Policies OS1, UDP1, UR2, BH7, D1, UR3, TM12, TM19A and D4 of the RUDP and form sustainable development compatible with the NPPF.

An objector was not able to attend the meeting and made the following points by e-mail:

- I would ask that before planning permission be approved, Committee members could visit the site and see for themselves the implications of such a development on my property, 24 Manor Road, which would be dwarfed by the erection of three storey dwellings.
- The very steep nature of this field and the problems associated with building on such a site and the existing water problems I have to contend with can only be appreciated by a visit.
- Apparently, surveys have been done but no one has asked to look at my garden to see the effects of the water.
- I understand that development should not be approved if they have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties.
- The loss of sunlight, privacy and overshadowing would have a dramatic effect on my garden.
- May I also point out that the beech hedge referred to in the document is my hedge and therefore is not theirs to retain.

Members made the following comments:

- There was not a drainage risk at the moment but there might be later on when the site was built on.
- Did the drainage conditions include retention tanks?
- Access to the site would be steep, would the houses be at the lower end of the site?

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture responded to Members' comments and made the following points:

- Yes, there would be water retention tanks.
- The attenuation tanks would go downhill.
- Access would be to the back garden of the bungalow.
- The conditions to any approval would protect neighbours.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions as set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture's technical report (Document "C").**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture***

**25. MIDDLE ISLE FARM, ISLE LANE, OXENHOPE, KEIGHLEY**

**Worth Valley**

Householder planning application for two storey extension to rear and enclosure of open porch to the front of the building at Middle Isle Farm, Isle Lane, Oxenhope, Keighley - 13/04278/HOU.

**The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Economy reported that the above application was withdrawn.**

**26. 9 GREENACRES DRIVE, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley Central**

Householder application for additional floor to existing detached bungalow with front face extension and entrance porch with rear infill extension to kitchen at 9 Greenacres Drive, Keighley – 14/01043/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Keighley Town Council had recommended that the application be approved. Five objections were received from four addresses. A Ward Councillor had sent an e-mail supporting the application. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "C".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the proposed extension would by reason of its proximity and excessive size result in loss of light to and overbearing impact on the private amenity space and ground floor habitable room windows

to the rear of the adjacent dwelling at 3 High Meadow and as such would not comply with Policies D1 and UR of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, the Householder Supplementary Planning Document and the core principle contained in Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that Planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. He therefore recommended refusal of the application. The agent for the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- The officer report was fair and balanced. It was a difficult application.
- A bedroom extension was approved in 2005, a conversion of detached garage into a bedroom.
- Only suitable land available for extension was at the front of the house.
- My client wants to extend his property to provide a larger home for his whole family.
- There would be a sun lounge for health purposes.
- The height of the property would remain unchanged.
- A front extension should be possible with the preservation of privacy as much as possible.
- Extending across the boundary had been given careful consideration for both houses.
- The distance to both houses would only change slightly.
- There was no intention to open a madrassa or mosque on the site, the prayer room would be for private use.
- The application was supported by Keighley Town Council.

Members made the following comments:

- Did the redesign mean a different application?
- Every Muslim has a private prayer room.
- The needs of the family was mentioned but there was a for sale sign on the property, are you staying or moving?
- I recommend approval of the application.
- This was not an easy decision I am not convinced by a refusal.
- I know the house, I don't see a problem, other houses have been extended.
- There should not be a red slate roof and the roof should match surrounding properties.

The agent for the applicant confirmed that if the applicant was not allowed to extend his property then his family would move to a new house.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture responded to Members' comments and made the following points:

- The previous application was bigger.
- There should be a condition against a red roof.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved subject to the following condition:**

**That the materials used for the roof match those used in surrounding properties.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture***

**27. LOW LODGE, BELGRAVE ROAD, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley Central**

Full application for the construction of a pair of semi-detached dwellings on land at Low Lodge, Belgrave Road, Keighley – 14/01427/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals. He reported that there were seven letters of support and six objection letters. The application is referred to panel by a Ward Councillor who supported the application. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “C”.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported on the reasons for refusal of the application as outlined in Document “C”. The Conservation Officer strongly opposed the application. He therefore recommended refusal of the application.

The agent for the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- If you look at the plans for plot one it was the same level as the lodge itself.
- This area was treated as wasteland and it would be better to build on it.
- In the winter months the trees would shed their leaves and there would be more light.
- The tree officer comments were not valid in this case as they don't reflect reality.
- At the front there was no overshadowing.
- The property was for a relative as the applicant was disabled.
- The mass had been reduced as it was previously a proposal for a third storey building.
- On balance the tree issue has been addressed.

Members made the following comments:

- It was not a planning matter who the house was for.
- Have any trees been felled?
- It doesn't look as big.
- Other houses are not in the curtilage area of the conservation area.
- The application should be treated on its individual merits and it would detract from the conservation area.

- I have full sympathy for the applicant.

The applicant stated that the development was for him and his son who helps him and it was the only chance to have his family in the same home.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture responded to Members' comments and made the following points:

- I disagree with the agent's view. The development would be a tight squeeze on this plot.
- The tree officer comments against the application were very strong in the report.
- A few trees were said by objectors to have been removed several years ago.
- Until now, the applicant had not made any mention of any special needs of a disabled person, as part of the application submission.
- In principle development on this site was unacceptable due to harm to trees and the conservation area.

The Council's legal representative advised the Panel that under Section 149 of the Equality Act there was a duty to pay due regard to the needs of people who had protected characteristics.

The Chair of the Panel confirmed that the Panel would take the Equality Act into consideration.

The Council's legal representative responded to member's comments and made the following points:

- "Due regard" was not defined and many pages of advice had been issued.
- Section 149 of the Equality Act should be taken into account as part of a balancing exercise in respect of a decision, whereby the need to give due regard must be weighed against other planning considerations.
- Under the National Planning Policy Framework there was a tension between planning guidelines and Section 149 of the Equality Act, with due regard to the Equality Act and National Planning Policy Framework.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be refused for the following reasons:**

- 1. Any new development in the context of the Laurel Mount estate would be visually intrusive, detracting from the setting of the gatehouse lodge and the relationship between the lodge and the villa. The development would interrupt the landscaped setting of the listed building and compromise the openness of the estate. The proposed development here would therefore cause substantial harm to the setting of the listed building and the interpretation of the heritage assets.**

Accordingly the principle of the proposed development within the grounds of Laurel Mount and its gatehouse is contrary to Policies UDP3, UR3, D1 and BH4A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and contrary to Paragraphs 132, 133, 134 and 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

2. The application site and associated grounds are situated in the Devonshire Park and Cliffe Castle Conservation Area, and are identified as making a positive contribution to the quality and character of the conservation area. There are key views towards the Grade II listed Laurel Mount from the main entrance, and there are key trees across the site.

The proposed development would appear as a most incongruous addition that would fail to preserve, enhance or enable better interpretation of the conservation area. As such the proposed development does not satisfy Policies UDP3, UR3, D1 and BH7 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework

3. The tree survey is out of date and there is no methodology for tree protection or retention during the proposed construction. The proposed development would involve alterations to site levels, which would affect root protection areas and so damage or kill mature trees on the site, to the detriment of the visual quality and character of this part of the Devonshire Park and Cliffe Castle Conservation Area, and the setting of the nearby Grade II Listed Building. Accordingly the proposals fail to satisfy Policies UR3, NE4, NE5, NE6, BH4A, BH7 and BH10 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, and fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The proposed garden spaces that are proposed on this cramped site would be dominated and overhung by mature trees. The shade cast would be excessive and would adversely affect the living conditions of occupiers of the properties, resulting in pressure to remove the trees once the proposed dwellings are in use. The likely tree losses would be damaging to the visual quality and character of the Devonshire Park and Cliffe Castle Conservation Area, and would harm the setting of the Grade II listed Laurel Mount.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies UR3, NE4, NE5, NE6, BH4A, BH7 and BH10 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, and fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture***

28. **REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT / PROSECUTION ACTION**

(i) **37 Hospital Road, Riddlesden, Keighley** **Keighley East**

Construction of garage outbuilding and timber and mesh aviary structure to rear of property – 14/00225/FUNA.

The garage and aviary was challenged as unauthorised and the owner advised to take action to rectify the breach of planning control. To date no application had been submitted and a recent site inspection confirms that the garage and aviary structure remain in situ. The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 25 June 2014.

(ii) **447 Kings Road, Wrose, Bradford** **Windhill & Wrose**

Unauthorised motor vehicle repairs – 14/00084/ENFCOU.

The owner and occupier of the property have been requested to cease the unauthorised activity, however complaints continued to be received.

On 2 June 2014 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) had authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

It was considered expedient to instigate Enforcement (Legal) Action as the unauthorised use of the property for motor vehicle repairs was detrimental to residential amenity, contrary to Policies UR3 and P7 of the Council's adopted Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

(iii) **9 Cliffe Avenue, Baildon** **Baildon**

Siting of a Metal Storage Container – 13/00963/ENFUNA

The metal storage container was considered to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policies UR3, UDP3 and D1 of the Councils Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) had authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 1 May 2014.

**Resolved –**

**That the decisions be noted.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture***



29. **DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

**Appeals Allowed**

**(i) Tarn Laddy, Tarn Lane, Laycock, Keighley Keighley West**

Siting of one 24m high (hub) wind turbine with tip height of 34.2m - Case No: 13/01802/FUL

Appeal Ref: 13/00098/APPFUL

**Appeals Withdrawn**

**(ii) Former Site of Ingrow Corn Mill, Ingrow Lane, Keighley Keighley West**

Residential development to construct 6 houses and 3 flats - Case No: 13/04597/OUT

Appeal Ref: 14/00031/APPNO2

**Appeals Dismissed**

**(iii) 2 Glen Rise, Baildon Baildon**

Conversion and extension of existing double garage to form accommodation ancillary to main house for an elderly resident - Case No: 14/01361/HOU

Appeal Ref: 14/00062/APPHOU

**(iv) 62 Woodside Drive Cottingley, Bingley Bingley Rural**

Two storey side extension to provide larger kitchen and additional two bedrooms - Case No: 14/00165/HOU

Appeal Ref: 14/00047/APPHOU

**(v) 7 Clarendon Road, Eldwick, Bingley Bingley**

Part single and part two storey extension - Case No: 14/00461/HOU

Appeal Ref: 14/00048/APPHOU

**(vi) Bank End Farm, Bank Lane, Silsden Craven**

Two 20kW wind turbines to produce electricity to power the applicant's farm and dwelling, with any surplus to be redirected back to the national grid. - Case No: 13/00095/FUL

Appeal Ref: 13/00089/APPFUL

**(vii) Land at Grid Ref 406719 438498, Ryecroft Road, Harden, Bingley** **Bingley Rural**

50kw monopole wind turbine. 24.6m hub - Case No: 13/01616/FUL

Appeal Ref: 13/00105/APPFUL

**(viii) Land Off Fyfe Lane, Baildon** **Baildon**

Construction of one detached dwelling - Case No: 13/00733/FUL

Appeal Ref: 14/00036/APPFL2

**(ix) Land to North And East of 13 The Bank, Leeming, Oxenhope, Keighley** **Worth Valley**

New vehicular access - Case No: 13/02143/FUL

Appeal Ref: 13/00152/APPFUL

**(x) Moorside Farm Broad Head Lane, Oakworth, Keighley** **Worth Valley**

Siting of one 30m high (hub) wind turbine and associated equipment - Case No: 13/01799/FUL

Appeal Ref: 13/00114/APPFUL

**Resolved –**

**That the decisions be noted.**

***NO ACTION***

**30. PETITION - LAND TO REAR OF 25-29 GRANGE ROAD, RIDDLEDEN, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley East**

Full planning application for construction of two detached houses to the rear of 25-29 Grange Road, Riddlesden – 14/01603/FUL.

**Resolved –**

**That the petition be noted.**

Chair

**Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Committee.**

minutes\plks23July

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER