

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley & Shipley) held on Wednesday 24 September 2014 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 1000
 Adjourned 1105
 Re-convened 1115
 Adjourned 1240
 Re-convened 1250
 Concluded 1345

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	INDEPENDENTS
Brown	Abid Hussain	Naylor
Shaw	Farley	
	Ross-Shaw	

Apologies: Councillor Lee

Observers: Councillor B M Smith (Minute 35c), Councillor M Slater (Minute 35d) and Councillor L'Amie (Minute 35e)

Councillor Abid Hussain in the Chair

31. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

No disclosures of interest in matters under consideration were received.

32. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meetings held on 2 July and 23 July 2014 be signed as a correct record.

33. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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



34. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.

35. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture presented **Document “E”** and **“F”**. Plans and photographs were displayed and/or tabled in respect of each application and representations summarised.

(a) **Craiglands Hotel, Cowpasture Road, Ilkley**

Ilkley

Full planning permission for a residential development of nine dwellings on the existing car park and formation of spa facilities in the basement of the existing Craiglands Hotel, Cowpasture Road, Ilkley - 13/04578/FUL

The Interim 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 of this application on the following grounds:

- Loss of hotel parking.
- Access would be dangerous at what was already a busy junction.
- Demand for the Spa facilities would most likely result in an increase in demand for parking provision.

16 Letters of representation had been received objecting to the proposal including one from a local councillor who requested referral to planning panel for determination should officers be minded to recommend approval. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “E”.

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that this proposal for planning permission had been fully assessed and it was considered to be acceptable in terms of the relevant development plan policies and the NPPF. The submitted plans as amended, and suggested mitigation measures relating to the adjacent South Pennine Moors demonstrated that the form and scale of development proposed can be satisfactorily accommodated within the site without giving rise to significant or material adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining SPA, SAC, SSSI, wildlife, properties, significant trees, or local character. The positive benefits of the scheme in helping to maintain the Craiglands Hotel a highly distinctive landmark of the conservation area outweigh any identified harm through loss of open space. Satisfactory arrangements for parking and servicing are provided and the scheme proposed a number of measures which would safely mitigate the impact of the additional vehicle movements generated by the additional dwellings. Subject to conditions, the development was considered to accord with Policies D1, BH7, BH10, UR3, NE5, NE6, NE7, NE8, NE9, TM2, TM12, TM19A and guidance within the NPPF. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions and changes to the following conditions as outlined below:

- (i) That the development should commence within a three year period.
- (ii) That Condition 1 – reference to [independent] be deleted.

- (iii) That Condition 1 is re-worded to make it explicit that the spa can only be used by guests staying at the hotel.
- (iv) That Condition 4 – reference to [brought into use] be deleted
- (v) That Condition 5 – reference to [brought into use] be deleted.

Two Ward Councillors had e-mailed their comments and were opposed to the application on the following grounds:

- Objections in response to highways and parking.
- Overdevelopment.
- Hotel uses block entrance to property.
- Vehicular access may suffer due to overdevelopment.
- There would be loss of a natural habitat.
- Increase in staff.
- Inadequate emergency access.
- Inappropriate development across the moor.

Members made the following comments:

- It only had 102 parking spaces.
- What was the loss of any provision.
- There would be a on street parking issue during big events.
- How would the parking be laid out?
- Make sure the spa was only used by visitors.
- How many car park spaces would be used by staff?
- Has the landslip issue been taken into account?

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

- Nine dwellings would add to a difficult traffic situation.
- Mini roundabout would need to be put in to make the situation safer.
- I am surprised there were no objections from highways.
- All the hotel visitors will not fill the parking spaces.
- Ilkey was already full of people trying to find places to park.
- In respect of drainage I am surprised that there was no objection from Yorkshire Water.

Two objectors were present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- I had written to highways in respect of inconsistent parking on the site.
- How can 102 parking places be adequate when the numbers of guests at the hotel range from 40 to 600 people?
- There was strictly no parking outside the premises.
- There should be a strong condition in respect to construction building work disturbance.
- The attitude towards the special protection area was lamentable.

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

- My client wants to run this hotel and provide a facility that would attract guests.
- It was a well thought out proposal.
- The County Conservation Officer has approved of the application.
- The main objections are Highways and we have come up with a suitable scheme with Council highway officers.

- Some car parking problems were linked to the school rather than the Hotel.
- We can get 102 spaces on the premises.
- The houses would supply a local need for housing.
- We are aware of the geo-technical information report.
- The proposals are acceptable to Council officers.
- The application accords with planning policies.

The Council's legal representative responded that use of the spa was ancillary to hotel use and limited to use of guests at the hotel but Condition 1 would have to be reworded to limit use of the spa to guests at the hotel.

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture responded to members comments and made the following points.

- A reasonable layout shows 102 parking spaces.
- The car park would be better organised.
- There would be no net loss of car parking place
- It was a reasonable walk to the Town Centre.
- A landslip issue has not been raised before, there was no anticipated risk from landslip.

Resolved –

That the application be approved subject to a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and for the reasons and subject to the conditions as set out in the Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture's technical report (Document "E") and the additional and amended conditions below:

- (i) **That the development should commence within a three year period.**
- (ii) **That Condition 1 – reference to [independent] be deleted.**
- (iii) **That Condition 1 is re-worded to make it explicit that the spa can only be used by guests staying at the hotel.**
- (iv) **That Condition 4 – reference to [brought into use] be deleted**
- (v) **That Condition 5 – reference to [brought into use] be deleted.**

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

- (b) **Flat 3, Stubham Court, 11 Stubham Rise, Ilkley** **Ilkley**

Full application for the installation of a balcony to an existing apartment Flat 3, Stubham Court, 11 Stubham Rise, Ilkley – 14/01767/FUL.

The Interim 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. The development would not be in-keeping with the Conservation Area and would be overbearing for the neighbours beneath.

The Parish Council had also asks that this application be referred to Panel. Objections were received from 7 separate addresses.

A Ward Councillor had objected to the application and requested that it be referred to the Panel if recommended for approval. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "E".

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the proposed balcony was a modest feature that was considered appropriate to the character and appearance of Middleton Conservation Area. It would not have any significant harmful effects on the amenity of occupiers of adjoining occupiers or on visual amenity and was considered to accord with Policies UR3, D1 and BH7 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

A Ward Councillor had e-mailed in comments saying the rear balcony was previously refused, that the front elevation would retain the integrity of the conservation area and there would be overshadowing of the flat below. Another Ward Councillor had also objected to the application.

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

- The proposed development was located in a conservation area.
- Keighley Area Committee had confirmed its status in 2005.
- It was a key example of the Victorian era.
- The development would not complement the site.
- It was not in proportion to the existing balcony.
- A previous application was refused.
- It would provide a view into an adjacent room.

Two objectors were present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- It was a key listed building of special status.
- An application to do work to the roof had been refused and why should the balcony be treated differently?
- You need to inspect the building to appreciate it.
- Ilkley Civic Society had objected .
- We don't want to set a precedent for two storey balconies.

Members made the following comments:

- It seemed like the same design as the existing balcony.
- It was a long continuous balcony which would not detract from the conservation area.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions as set out in the Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture's technical report (Document "E") and subject to the following additional condition:

- (i) **That the development should commence within a three year period.**

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

Demolition of existing lock up garage buildings and construction of five new dwellings in two and three unit blocks. Garage court at Castle Hill, Castle Road, Ilkley – 14/02116/FUL.

The Interim 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 due to the scale of the proposed development which it considered too large in proportion to adjacent buildings of historical importance. With inadequate parking provision and concerns over potential drainage problems.

This is an extremely sensitive area of historical importance and the development would overshadow the Manor House Museum affecting the setting of a Listed Building.

Objections had been received from 18 local addresses and organisations (including Ilkley Civic Society and Ilkley Design Statement Group). The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "E".

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the English Heritage has confirmed that it supports the application subject to the need to secure via condition an agreed written scheme for further archaeological investigation. The design of the proposed dwellings is respectful of the surrounding urban grain and the amended proposals were for an overall mass and scale of proposed dwellings that would not dominate in views of the Manor House and preserve the setting of this Grade I listed building. The setting of other heritage assets would not be harmed and the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved. The density of development was reflective of the close knit nature of the conservation area but was also considered to provide adequate separation taking into account the amenity of existing occupiers.

It was not accepted that this relatively small residential scheme would generate significant levels of additional traffic along Castle Hill given previous use of the site. The level of car parking was now adequate and the means of access as been widened to allow for turning manoeuvres. The proposals achieve an appropriate balance between accommodating the needs of vehicles whilst maintaining the close knit character of this sensitive historic area.

The proposal accords with Policies BH3, BH4A, BH7, D1, UR3, TM2, TM19A and TM12 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

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

- There was lack of parking.
- There would be pressure on restricted parking.
- It was an historic building.
- There would problems caused by construction traffic.
- The extension from Bridge Lane was not taken into account.

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

- Development was broadly welcomed.
- It was the centre of the old conservation area.
- Finance had been spent on the museum.
- Groups had volunteered to keep the manor open.

- It was in the historic core of Ilkley.
- The unmarked service path near the site needed improvement.
- The drainage details were unknown and could alter natural drainage in the area.
- Archaeological issues should be investigated.
- It was good that a self-seeded tree would be removed.

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

- We are not opposed to the development in principle.
- The proximity and design of Units 1 and 2 was an issue.
- It was still in the conservation area.
- There would be a long low roof.
- In respect of density Unit 2 would be too close to the suggested boundary area.
- There were traffic implications with increased journeys being generated.
- Traffic and parking was already a problem.
- Local businesses already existed in the area.

A supporter of the applicant was present and made the following points:

- Units 2 and 5 would have adopted combined drainage.
- It was a sensitive site as the development would be near an ancient monument.
- The report in 2013 had led to an Archaeological dig which had invited local residents to view it.
- English Heritage would permit development.
- There has been consultation with residents as they were contacted in June but there was no response.
- The development was supported by English Heritage, West Yorkshire Archaeological Society, as well as the Council's Highways and Conservation Officers.

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture responded to members comments and made the following points.

- English Heritage supported the application.
- The scheme would enhance Manor House Area.
- The scheme would contribute positively to the street scene.
- Parking would be incorporated within the site.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions as set out in the Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture's technical report (Document "E") and subject to condition 11 being amended to refer to two parking spaces per unit and the following additional condition:

- (i) That the development should commence within a three year period.

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(d) **Land to North of Back Shaw Lane, Hainworth Shaw, Keighley** **Keighley East**

An application for the construction of an agricultural building for housing of livestock on land at Back Shaw Lane, Hainworth Shaw, Keighley – 14/02281/FUL.

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Keighley Town Council had recommended approval. A petition of objection containing 9 signatures has been received. It petitions referral to Panel. A significant number of objection communications have been received from one neighbouring occupier. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "E".

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the building was designed for purposes connected with agriculture and so was an exception to the normal presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would form part of a group of functional farm buildings already in place on this land and on an adjoining site. Design and materials were appropriate to its function and reflected the character of the adjoining buildings. The building was sited sufficiently away from the nearest dwelling and the siting and scale of the building was such that it was not envisaged that it would cause any significant adverse impact on the amenity of occupants of any adjoining properties. The proposal was considered to accord with Policies GB1, GB2, D1, UR3, NE3 and NE3A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District and was compatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions

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

- The Panel had objected to the application last year.
- These are same plans as last year.
- The barn should be moved far away together with the access.
- It was difficult to calculate the amount of traffic volume to be generated.
- The Environment report was brief.
- There would be further erosion of residents amenity.
- Planning officers had ignored environmental health officers advice.
- The application was in contravention of 6 RUDP policies.
- Odour was not the only issue but extensive livestock rearing outside someone's home.

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

- There were contradictions in the environmental officer advice.
- The case officer had said the objectors had no right to complain.
- The rights of people living in the area should be paramount.
- It was a huge cattle shed with a lot of beef cattle.
- There were enforcement notices on two other buildings.
- It was not a working farm but a small field.
- The main part of the business was a highway company while parking was a sideshow.
- There was no farm house.
- The objectors supported responsible farming, they have no choice but to protect their amenity.
- The objectors have sought mediation in this matter, their rights have not been

protected.

- The proposals are unsuitable and access should be from the south.

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

- The application was supported by planning, highways and environmental health officers.
- The subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.
- It was a farm and had DEFRA holdings.
- The building would be located with other buildings.
- There was no evidence of statutory nuisance or odour.
- The cattle only need bringing to the site sometimes.
- A new hedge would be planted

Members agreed that the proposed access route to the site and increased use of said access would have an adverse impact on the amenity of occupants of the adjoining residential property.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposed access route to the site and increased use of said access will have an adverse impact on the amenity of occupants of the adjoining residential property. It would therefore be contrary to Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District.

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(e) **Long Meadows, Fyfe Lane, Baildon**

Baildon

Construction of detached dwelling and car port in grounds of existing residence at Long Meadows, Fyfe Lane, Baildon, BD17 6DP – 13/01663/FUL.

This item was deferred from the Panel meeting of 2 July 2014. Following the Officer presentation, an objector addressed the Panel and said that neighbours had not had an opportunity to see up to date consultation advice from the Council's Planning Trees Team regarding the impact of development on the trees along the boundary with neighbouring gardens. It was explained that Trees Team advice had been given verbally and by email (rather than in the form of a formal memo) and was based on a joint site visit undertaken by Planning Officers and the Tree Officer. Nevertheless, the advice from the Council's Legal Officer was that, in the interests of natural justice, objectors should have an opportunity to see that advice in written form and so it was requested that a formal consultation from Trees Team be prepared and should be posted with the application details. This was done on 30 July 2014.

Baildon Parish Council had objected to the application on the grounds that the new building would not be in keeping with the surrounding area as it would appear to be too large for its plot. A previous planning application was rejected on these grounds and the Council does not believe these plans substantially change.

Letters of representation have been received from 13 separate addresses.

A local Councillor also requested referral to panel should the application be supported by officers.

A petition has also been received objecting to the application with 33 signatures.

The petition stated that the proposal was a significant overdevelopment of the plot and the proposed property was out of keeping with surrounding property. That the proposed development is too close to the row of protected and mature sycamore trees and wildlife they might support. The proposed development if permitted could set a precedent. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "E".

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the development would provide new housing within this established residential area. Suitable layout and design was accommodated to reflect the prevailing character of housing in the surrounding area and the proposed residential use would have no significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would not adversely impact upon mature protected trees to the site boundary. Appropriate and acceptable arrangements were made for parking, turning and servicing of the development and there would be no adverse impact on highway safety. The development would accord with Policies UR3, D1, NE5, NE6, TM12, TM19A and TM2 of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan and guidance in the NPPF. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions

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

- It was too large for the plot and not in keeping with surrounding area.
- I agree with the views of Baildon Parish Council.
- There had been three tree reports 2 by the council and one independent consultant.
- There would be damage to trees.
- Long term pruning would be necessary.
- There would be problems in respect of off street parking,

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

- A dormer bungalow was more appropriate not a large house.
- Planning officers had stated that the new house would not be bigger than the old house but the ridge height was one metre higher.
- This latest application should be refused.
- Trees need protecting and the tree officer has made a complete U-turn from his previous report.
- Our lives would be in danger if the trees fall.
- It was not sensible to proceed with the proposal.
- A petition signed by 33 persons was opposed to the application as well as 2 Ward Councillors and Baildon Parish Council.
- The building was too high, too large and not in keeping with surrounding properties.

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

- Four tree reports had been done, three by the Council and one done by us.
- It was never our intention to remove or damage the tree and we had hired a consultant to prevent damage to the tree.
- Other properties have been given permission.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions as set out in the Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture’s technical report (Document “E”) and subject to the following additional conditions:

- (i) **That details of the exact pruning specification proposed be submitted to the local planning authority before commencement of development and that any work carried out will be in accordance with BS: 3998 (2010) or its successor.**
- (ii) **That the development should commence within a three year period.**

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(f) **4 Fern Hill Road, Shipley**

Shipley

Change of use to mixed use for the purpose of running a childminding business known as Westfield House from a residential property at 4 Fern Hill Road, Shipley – 14/01985/FUL

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that at the date of writing this report 1 September 2014 the representations received were as follows:

- One objection.
- Eleven representations had been received in support, including from the Head Teacher of Saltaire Primary School and the Deputy Head of St Walburga’s Catholic Primary School.

One Ward Councillor support comment and request for a panel decision if numbers were to be capped. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “E”.

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the use of the premises as a childminding business with the proposed 5 full time and 3 part time registered childminders operating from the premises would be contrary to the residential character of the property and detrimental to the amenity of the occupants of nearby residential property by reason of the noise and general disturbance it would create. It would be contrary to Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended refusal of the application.

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

- I run a good operation and there was increased demand for our services.
- I need to operate at an increased level.
- We care for 26 children not 30.
- The most number of children looked after in a day was 18.
- We can’t employ the current number of staff unless we increase numbers.
- We are opposite to a local school.
- We have values of respect and nurturing.
- Most people walk to our establishment.
- Children playing was a usual noise in our area.
- The afternoons are less noisy.
- We shall plant additional hedges if necessary.

- We shall take mitigating measures if needed.

Resolved –

That the application be approved subject to the hours of operation of the business being from 7.30am to 6.00pm, Monday to Friday.

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(g) **8 Ryshworth Bridge, Keighley Road, Bingley**

Bingley

Full application for construction of retail unit with residential unit above.
8 Ryshworth Bridge, Keighley Road, Bingley – 14/01437/FUL.

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that a petition in support has been received seeking referral to Panel and four objection letters and five supporting letters have also been received. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “E”.

The Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported on the reasons for refusal as outlined in Document “E”.

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

- I had applied for planning permission in 2007.
- This new application had undergone consultation with planning officers.
- The government had recommended smaller properties.
- This was scruffy land that I am trying to tidy up.
- The look was a bit different know.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) **The proposed development would result in an incongruous new building that would appear out of place in the street scene to the detriment of local visual amenity contrary to Policies UDP3, UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**
- (2) **The height of the development in close proximity to neighbouring gardens, its massing and the blank appearance of the proposed building when viewed from neighbouring property would adversely affect the amenities and outlook of neighbours to an unacceptable degree contrary to Policies UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**
- (3) **The use of the proposed external stairway as access to the upper floor would give rise to significant loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers contrary to Policies UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(h) **Requests for Enforcement/Prosecution Action**

(i) **Denholme Business Centre, Halifax Road, Denholme** **Bingley Rural**

This report relates to conditions 4 and 5 of the planning approval for the site ref: 13/0113/MAF and controls the operating hours and times of deliveries 12/00699/ENFCOU.

The breach relates to activities on site occurring outside of the approved hours.

An enforcement notice was authorised on 22 July 2014 by the Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees).

(ii) **Marsh Top Farm, Marsh Lane, Oxenhope** **Worth Valley**

The enforcement action requires the dismantling of an inappropriately sited agricultural building currently located in close proximity to residential property – 13/00980/ENFUNA.

Planning permission has recently been granted for relocation of the building to a more appropriate location ref: 13/02662/FUL, however such relocation had not yet occurred.

An enforcement notice was authorised on 28 August 2014 by the Area Planning Manager.

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(i) **Decisions Made by the Secretary of State**

The Panel noted the following appeal decisions taken by the Secretary of State:

APPEALS ALLOWED

(i) **Heights Farm, Heights Lane, Silsden** **Craven**

Installation of one 50kW wind turbine with an overall height of 34.5m (i.e. to blade tip) - Case No: 13/02709/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 13/00127/APPFUL.

APPEALS WITHDRAWN

(ii) **1 Moor Lane, Addingham** **Craven**

Appeal against Enforcement Officer - Case No: 13/01139/ENFCOU.

Appeal Ref: 14/00064/APPENF.

APPEALS DISMISSED

(iii) **196 - 198 Leeds Road, Shipley** **Windhill and Wrose**

Change of use of outbuilding to form 4 no flats including construction of two storey extension, altered roofline, new entrance and bin store - Case No: 14/01354/FUL

Appeal Ref: 14/00068/APPFL2.

(iv) **29 Sunset Drive, Ilkley**

Ilkley

Construction of new dwelling attached to the existing house, including demolition of the existing garage and utility - Case No: 13/03987/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 14/00058/APPFL2.

(v) **Former Site of Wild Heather, Haworth Road, Cullingworth, Bingley**

Bingley

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 13/00527/ENFAPP.

Appeal Ref: 14/00042/APPENF.

(vi) **Land North of Westwood Mount, Westwood Drive, Ilkley**

Ilkley

Construction of dwelling with attached double garage and related external works - Case

No: 13/04845/FUL

Appeal Ref: 14/00063/APPFL2

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

ACTION: Interim Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

Chair

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

i:\minutes\plks24Sept

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