

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Thursday 16 October 2014 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 1005

Adjourned 1150

Reconvened 1155

Concluded 1255

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	THE INDEPENDENTS
Brown	Lee (Chair)	Naylor
Sykes	Abid Hussain (DCh)	
	Farley	
	M Slater	

Apologies: Councillors Brown and Ross-Shaw

Observers: Councillor Khadim Hussain (Minute 39 (b)) Councillor Cooke (Minute 39 (f))

Councillor Lee in the Chair

36. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

No disclosures of interest in matters under consideration were received.

37. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

38. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.



39. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS**

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture presented **Documents “G” and “H”**. Plans and photographs were displayed and/or tabled in respect of each application and representations summarised.

(a) **LAND AT HAINWORTH WOOD ROAD, KEIGHLEY**

Keighley East

A full application for the construction of eight terraced houses on land at Hainworth Wood Road, Keighley - Bradford - 14/03189/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the proposal was a full application for the construction of eight two storey dwellings. There had been a previous grant of outline permission for eight houses in 2011. At that time the land had been owned by the Council but it had since been sold. The outline permission had now expired. Work on excavation had been commenced by the new owners prior to approval of the full planning application. This had provoked hostility with local residents and health and safety agencies and the matter had been referred to planning enforcement officers. Document “G” summarised 25 representations which had been received and included concerns such as loss of parking; inadequate turning for vehicles; increased traffic and the design being out of character with other houses in the area.

It was questioned if the development had commenced after the outline planning permission had expired on 23 September 2014 and it was believed that the excavation had commenced prior to that time.

Following extensive consultations a number of conditions had been suggested and were detailed in Document “G”.

Following questions about the number of bedrooms the properties would include it was confirmed there would be four. It was questioned why with the number of children in the area increasing no social contribution was requested of the developer. It was explained that the threshold for the number of houses to request contributions to affordable housing or a contribution to education had not been met. The number of properties which would enable such contributions was 15 for affordable housing and 10 for education although those thresholds were under review.

Members questioned the necessity to include Phase 2 reports, currently included as a condition of approval, at the time the applications were being considered. It was explained that to impose such conditions at the start of a development would be very expensive. The conditions were easily enforced and insistence that such measures be carried out prior to approval would be costly to developers and delay developments unnecessarily. It was agreed that the issue could be considered at the next Planning Chairs’ meeting.

A local resident addressed the meeting. She maintained that she was relaying the opinions of all residents and raised issues with the contents of Document “G” including:-

- Representations numbered, 5, 12, 17 20 and 22 to 25 in Document “G” had not been answered in any way. Point 2 was not fully addressed and the response to point 3 was based on assumption not investigation.
- Ground levels at the site had been raised changing the over land surface water flow patterns.

- The development would consist of 70 houses per hectare which was not in accordance with policies H7 and H8 of the RUDP.
- The proposed development would lead to overcrowding.
- There would be a loss of open space.
- The previous use of the land could not be referred to as temporary as it had been used beyond 20 years.
- The land had been used in the same manner for 30 years.
- Trees planned and allowed to mature for over 30 years were not a temporary measure.
- The land was protected by the RUDP. It was not recorded on policy maps as it was less than 0.4 hectares but was protected and covered by all appropriate policies.
- The area had a deficiency of open green space.
- One area of green space was not adequate for a community of nearly 2,500 people.
- The Council's continued maintenance of the land and continued public access qualified the land as amenity and/or recreation ground.
- Residents would be unable to continue to park their cars. Their parking spaces would be reduced to one per household. Many residents had two cars and would be forced to park on Hainworth Wood Road.
- Parallel parking and bays were not in keeping with the area.
- Residents did not want marked out bays.
- Consideration had not been taken of the impact of extra cars on Hainworth Wood Road due to loss of parking on Bracken and Larch Street.
- The statement in Document "G" that no recorded personal injury accidents had occurred was questionable as several had occurred.
- The design and materials of the proposed houses did not reflect the character or proportions of current houses and were not appropriate to the area.
- Residents will be overlooked due to incorrect measuring; the alignment of windows and lack of greenery to screen the houses from each other.
- Privacy would not be maintained for existing houses or afforded to the new properties.
- The overlooking, loss of parking and amenity would reduce existing house values.
- Residents would suffer the environmental and economic impact of being unable to dry clothes outside.
- The development did not comply with RUDP policies H7, H8, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, cf6, D1 or UDP 5 (4) nor did it comply with the Localism Act of the Statement of Community Involvement along with other policies and legislation.
- The report was contradictory.
- A letter of formal complaint had been submitted regarding the sale of the land and an application for Village Green status had been submitted. It would be prudent not to allow planning approval until those matters had been resolved.
- The overall consensus from people who knew the area was disbelief. All thought it was inappropriate to build on the land.

Corresponding officer comments were included in Document "G" and reiterated at the meeting including that the number of proposed dwellings in the proposals was less than would be required to trigger a formal assessment of traffic. Individuals did not have the right to park on the highway. The proposals would provide two off street parking spaces per dwelling and the development had widened the road and provided formal parking bays.

The Council's Legal Representative reported that the application for Village Green status was an entirely separate issue as the land was a formally developed site. The Strategic

Director, Regeneration and Culture, explained that that area had been kept tidy by a job creation scheme in the 1980s.

In response to concerns that the development was contrary to policies in the RUDP the Strategic Director stated that he was confident that the development was within the density range and compatible with the policies referred to. Planning policy considered the number of dwellings per hectare and not the number of bedrooms in properties. The development under consideration was for 50 dwellings per hectare and was within the 30 – 50 range. It was also felt that the design and materials were entirely appropriate to the character of the area and the local context.

The applicant's representative was present at the meeting and made the following statements:

- Opinions on the style of the properties were subjective.
- The design of the homes was to reflect the modern needs of residents.
- The use of natural stone would increase the cost of the houses and could make the properties less affordable.
- The developers had been aware of the history of the land. As there were no records regarding the site investigations had been required to be conducted prior to full planning approval to ascertain how the cellars of homes previously on the site had been in-filled.
- It had been hoped that the application would be approved earlier but delays had been incurred because the decision had been appealed.
- An application had been made to building control officers and the site had been checked and found to be safe by other bodies prior to commencement.
- Whilst work was ongoing the developer was willing to assist residents with parking. Construction vehicles would be moved if they blocked the area.

The impact on local residents was discussed. Assurances were provided that should the application be approved the development would not be permitted to continue until a number of the conditions had been fulfilled including the means of vehicle and pedestrian access; proposed highway improvements and the provision of parking spaces.

It was acknowledged that the area had been previously developed and that conditions regarding the materials were strong enough to ensure that the development would be in keeping with the local area.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture's technical report (with an additional condition (13) and the amendment of conditions 2, 8, 9 and 11 as detailed below):

- (2) No further development shall take place until such time as a Section 278 agreement under the Highways Act 1980 is completed by the developer and further that no occupation of any dwelling until the means of vehicular and pedestrian access and proposed highway improvement to Larch Street and Bracken Street including the provision of the parking spaces are completed as indicatively shown on drawing 201c.**

Reason: To ensure that a suitable form of access is made available to serve the development in the interests of highway safety and to accord with Policies TM2 and TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (8) No further development shall take place until details of a scheme for foul and surface water drainage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme so approved shall thereafter be implemented prior to the commencement of further development.

Reason: To ensure proper drainage of the site and to accord with Policies UR3 and NR16 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (9) No further development shall take place until such time as the developer has submitted and obtained written approval of a report to the Council that determines the extent of any land drainage network on the site and proposals for dealing with any watercourses, culverts, land drains, springs, existing within the site boundary so that surface water does not have an adverse impact on adjacent landowners. The recommendations of the approved report shall be carried out in their entirety during construction of the dwellings hereby approved.

Reason: To prevent surface water from the site having a detrimental impact on adjacent landowners and to accord with Policy NR16 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (11) No further development shall take place until such time as a report, setting out the findings of an investigation and risk assessment to assess the nature and extent of any contamination affecting the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report should include:

- (i) A survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination.
- (ii) An assessment of the potential risks to all significant receptors including human health and controlled waters.
- (iii) An appraisal of remedial options.
- (iv) Identification of the preferred remedial option.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination are appropriately investigated, in accordance with policies UR3, NR17 and NR17A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and paragraph 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- (13) That construction works relating to the application be restricted to 0730 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday and Saturday am only. Construction works shall not be permitted on Sundays or Public Holidays.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(b) HOME VIEW, WESTVIEW GROVE, KEIGHLEY**Keighley Central**

A householder planning application for the construction of an extension at 'Home View', 4a Westview Grove, Keighley, BD20 6JJ. – 14/03790/HOU

Members questioned the size of the proposal and whether it would be used as a house or care home. They were advised that the application was for the extension of a domestic dwelling and any change of use would require a further planning application.

A resident opposing the application was in attendance and reported that the building had been a two bedroom detached bungalow for 45 years. He reported that the original developers had wanted to build a semi detached property but had been unable to obtain planning permission.

He explained that he needed access around the area and questioned why the applicant would require a six bedroom home. His view was that the extension was excessive. It was also claimed that there were existing problems with drainage and access.

In response it was clarified by the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture, that no problems had been reported by the Council's drainage or highways officers.

A local ward Councillor spoke in support of the application. He explained that the size of the extension was to allow the family to care for their five children and an elderly relative. The applicant had endeavoured to comply with planning regulations and to address his neighbours' concerns. Conditions to prevent any intrusion and protect residents' privacy would be adhered to.

Members questioned the height of the proposed boundary fence and were advised that the height was permissible under permitted development as long as it did not adjoin the highway.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture's technical report.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(c) STREET HOUSE FARM, THE STREET, ADDINGHAM**Craven**

Full planning application for residential development of three dwellings (Plots 1, 2 and 3) (as amended). Land at Street House Farm, The Street, Addingham, Ilkley – 13/03716/FUL.

Members were reminded that the application had been considered in detail at the meeting on 2 July 2014. At that time Members had requested that the applicant undertake an archaeological evaluation of the site to establish whether the projected Ribchester to Ilkley Roman road through Wharfedale would be affected by the proposed developments.

Members had requested that evaluation with the use of ground penetrating surveys be undertaken. Document "G" revealed that consultants engaged by the applicant had subsequently advised that radar surveys were not suitable at the site. In line with the

consultants' advice the applicant had commissioned an appropriate company to dig trenches to carry out the survey. All trenches had yielded negative results and no archaeological evidence had been found.

Resolved –

That, with the deletion of Condition 7, the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture's technical report.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(d) **LAND AT THE REAR OF 1 TO 5 STATION ROAD, MENSTON** **Ilkley**
ILKLEY

Full application for construction of two detached dwellings to the rear of numbers 1, 3 and 5 Station Road, Menston, LS29 6JL with formation of vehicular access between 3 and 5 Station Road – 14/02695/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture, explained that the site comprised the long back gardens of three large houses fronting Station Road in Menston. It was reported that gardens had been removed from the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework with the aim of enabling Local Planning Authorities to more strongly protect the character of established residential areas from 'garden grabbing'. The framework had not made development of garden land unacceptable as a matter of principle and there remained a need to make more effective use of land for housing, where appropriate, and having regard to other planning policies.

Members were assured that the proposed dwellings were not present on the street scene and the houses on Station Road would retain sizeable garden plots. There had been 11 representations received about the proposal nine of which were in opposition and two in support. The representations were summarised in Document "G".

A Menston Parish Councillor in attendance explained that the Parish Council were concerned about the access to the proposed properties and the impact of the proposals on the residents of Farley View. It was maintained that Station Road was a busy area with passengers travelling to the station and there were concerns that access to the properties via the area between two existing properties would be dangerous. Alternative measures were suggested. It was also felt that the new properties would overlook a north facing house on Farley Mews and would have a detrimental effect on lighting.

In response to suggestions about alternative access it was explained that it would not be possible to gain good access to the site from the Menston Snooker Club development. Other suggestions proposed involved land not owned by the developer.

A local resident addressed the meeting. She raised a number of concerns about the proposal including that:-

- The main objectives of the Government, with regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, were to provide affordable housing for all communities and all factors pertaining to that issue were to be seriously considered in relation to the matter of garden grabbing by residents.

- The planned development of two five bedroom detached dwellings did not fit the requirements of affordable housing. There were plenty of five bedroom houses on the former Menston Highroyds hospital development.
- The neighbourhood would be disadvantaged by the loss of remaining open garden spaces along with the bio diversity that the established gardens contained.
- The report under consideration referred to the development being in character of the locality but there were no five bedroom dwellings surrounding the development – they were all semi detached.
- The Council tax banding of Wharfe Mews had reduced in May 2014 and this evidenced that the amenity had been adversely affected.
- Although the report justified the development as compatible with nearby developments the neighbourhood would take the view that the area was overdeveloped.
- Residents on Wharfe Mews would feel ‘boxed in’ and their quality of life would be seriously impacted upon.
- The extent of the proposed building mass on 2 Wharfe Mews could not fail to cause loss of amenity. It would have an oppressive impact, block the sunlight and overshadow the property. It did not meet the requirements of the RUDP. The development had not been accurately viewed from the perspective of that property as the development could not be viewed from a public road and no visits had been made to that house.
- If the development were to be approved the impact on residents could be reduced by the replacement of one of the two storey houses with a bungalow.
- The Government were keen to reduce parking spaces for new properties where local travel could be utilised. The report under consideration had a double standard recommendation by increasing the number of parking spaces allowed for new houses.
- A building site would create additional pressure on Station Road and create added safety hazards. Large vehicles would have to manoeuvre backwards and forwards from the single access drive.
- Victorian gate posts would have to be removed to create a driveway access to the development. The character of the road was defined by its Victorian features.

Members questioned if improvements to sight lines from the proposal would be improved and it was explained that the driveway was being widened and would be 4.5 metres wide. Sight lines would be protected by the Traffic Regulation Order (yellow lines) in the vicinity.

The applicant addressed the meeting and explained that he and a neighbour, living in the area for a number of years, and with children attending the local schools, had made the application to develop homes for their families. It was explained that they had been approached by developers to construct six houses on the land. They believed that they could develop the two properties and provide modern sustainable homes. It was maintained that the new development would provide safer access than the current arrangements which required vehicles to reverse onto Station Road.

The applicant’s representative explained that they had endeavoured to address all the issues which had been raised by neighbours. The roof had been designed to minimise the impact and the two storey elements had been set to minimise overshadowing and provide maximum light for all. The applicants wanted a high quality design and the Victorian gate posts would be set either side of the driveway.

In response to questions about the likelihood of vehicles reversing on to Station Road it was explained that a turning area had been designed to allow all vehicles to exit on to Station Road in a forward direction.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture’s technical report.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(e) **MERCY MINISTRIES, CRAGG ROAD, LOWER TOWN, Worth Valley
OXENHOPE, KEIGHLEY**

Full planning application for construction of new office and administration building and the extension and reconfiguration of existing car park at Mercy Ministries, Cragg Royd, Lower Town, Oxenhope, Keighley, West Yorkshire BD22 9JE – 14/03206/FUL.

Members were advised that Cragg Royd was a large detached house set in extensive grounds on the edge of Oxenhope. The surroundings were semi rural in character. Mercy Ministries was a charitable body that provided specialist residential care in that building.

The proposal under consideration was to develop detached office accommodation within the grounds to alleviate increasing conflicts between the administration and care functions in the original house as it had become increasingly crowded. Access to the site was via a private road off Lower Town. Photographs depicting the site of the proposal and increased car parking provision were presented.

A Parish Councillor addressed the meeting as follows:-

- The proposed development was inappropriate at the site.
- Cragg Royd was located in a conservation area; it was unique and complemented the area and its open spaces.
- The proposed office block appeared modern and out of character of the area.
- The design of the proposal had ignored the requirements of a conservation area and the village.
- Deciduous trees in the area would result in the proposed building being visible for four months of the year.
- The width and surface of the roads in the vicinity were not capable of accommodating increased traffic. The junction in the vicinity was not wide enough for two vehicles to pass.
- It was not believed that people would walk to the new buildings as the area was hilly and bus services were limited. Traffic congestion would be caused.

In response the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture, confirmed that the applicants had provided a transport statement. It was estimated that the development would produce eight extra traffic movements per day.

Members questioned the design of the proposed office block and why the construction was not of materials similar to Cragg Royd. It was explained that the structure was an office block. There had been many discussions with the developers about the proposed

materials. The proposal would be located separately to the house and only the roof would be visible when the trees lost their leaves.

The applicant in attendance maintained that the comments made by the Parish Council had been considered. The application had been through a meaningful pre-application process and those comments had been fed into the design process. A heritage appraisal had also been conducted. He was satisfied that the right approach had been taken with the decision to develop the office block without it masquerading as a house. There would be more use of natural materials and the roof would not be slate. The development was carefully sited away from the house and would be screened not only by the trees. Cragg Royd would remain as the dominant building.

He confirmed that there would be no harm to protected trees and that no highway objections had been received. One single representation had been received about access and Mercy Ministries were happy to agree to conditions regarding signage or road markings.

The development would allow the charity to enhance their charitable work and would provide employment.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture’s technical report.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(f) **THE GEORGE PUBLIC HOUSE, STATION ROAD,
CULLINGWORTH, BINGLEY**

Bingley Rural

Change of use of garden area to landscaped beer garden, including demolition of the existing garage and construction of a new storage garage at land adjacent to the George Public House, Station Road, Culling worth, Bingley – 14/02313/FUL.

The site description informed Members that the site under consideration was a plot of land on the side of The George Public House and was located within the Cullingworth Conservation Area. Behind the site was a dwelling, Dunelm Cottage, with windows facing across onto the land and to the south of the site were flats at Curtis Court. A summary of representations in support and opposing the development were provided.

A local Ward Councillor addressed the meeting. He spoke in support of the application and explained that the premises had been taken over by a new landlord who had transformed the business into a successful enterprise which was now an asset to the village. The business now employed 23 people and the proposal would transform the area of land under discussion from an untidy space into an attractive garden.

He believed that a beer garden was the optimum use for the land. Because of the inclement English weather the facility would probably only be operational for six months of the year and for perhaps only 70 days of the year would operate into the evening. It was acknowledged that the garden could generate some noise but that this would not be an everyday occurrence. It was stressed that no objections had been received from the Council’s Environmental Health department and that conditions to require acoustic fencing could be used to protect local residents from noise disturbance.

A local resident opposing the application presented his objections to Members. He stated that he lived at Dunelm Cottage and prior to the land being sold by the Council he had enjoyed right of access across the land. He had attempted to purchase the land and had been informed it was not for sale. It had subsequently been sold by the Council and he had lost his rights of access.

He explained that under the proposals he would have a wooden wall 20 metres from his lounge window and likened the outcome of that to “living in Colditz”. It was maintained that acoustic fencing would not protect the residents’ of Curtis Court and it was feared that noise would echo around George Square, Church Street and Station Road. Concern was expressed that proposed storage bins would be located very close to his granddaughter’s bedroom and fears about waste food and rats in the location were raised.

The vehicular access to the pub was mentioned and concerns about loss of car parking spaces and the subsequent narrowing of the road by parked vehicles were raised.

Members questioned the ownership of the land and were advised that the plot had been sold by the Council to the public house.

The applicant and his agent spoke in support of their application. The photographs presented in the officer’s presentation were referred to and it was maintained that Dunelm Cottage was already in the vicinity of the outdoor social area of the pub. It was explained that the area was subject to noise measuring 40 to 45 decibels from passing wagons. The beer garden would be in use for limited hours depending on the weather. A proposed acoustic fence would reduce potential noise disturbance and with the measures proposed the application had not received opposition from Environmental Health. It was maintained that the proposals would improve the appearance of the Conservation Area

It was stressed that the public house was a local business employing 23 people. There had been historical noises complaints prior to the takeover of the business but none had since been received. It was felt that assumptions should not be made that customers of the beer garden would act antisocially. The business operated restrictions which prevented customers taking glasses outside of the premises after 10pm and the serving of food concluded at 8.45pm. The applicant assured Members that he would police the area; that he and his partner were responsible people; they had a brewery located in the village and were proud of their achievements.

Members questioned whether seats at the front of the property would remain and were advised that a couple of the benches would be retained as regular customers enjoyed that area. It was also confirmed that there were no plans to install heaters in the garden area.

In response to concerns about the extent of operational outdoor areas the Council’s Legal Representative advised that conditions could be applied to restrict the numbers of tables and customers.

The impact on the amenity of local properties was discussed. It was confirmed that a fence to be located 6 to 7 metres from those houses would be a permanent structure.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the reasons as set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture’s technical report.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

(g) **REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION**

(i) **34 CAROLINE STREET, SALTAIRE, SHIPLEY BD18 4PN** **Shipley**

Construction of timber outbuilding to the rear of the property – 13/00762/ENFUNA

On 4 September 2014 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice under delegated powers.

(ii) **39 SOUTHWAY, ELDWICK, BINGLEY, BD16 3EW** **Bingley**

Unauthorised operation of a Children’s Day Nursery – 13/00940/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 17 September 2014.

(iii) **73 BINGLEY ROAD, SHIPLEY, BD18 4SB** **Shipley**

Removal of chimney stack. – 14/00579/ENFLBC

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 4 September 2014.

(iv) **79 BINGLEY ROAD, SALTAIRE, SHIPLEY.** **Shipley**

Unauthorised display of an advertisement banner – 14/00162/ENFADV

Further to an investigation the occupier of the premises was summonsed to appear at Bradford Magistrates Court on 22 July 2014. These proceedings related to the continued unauthorised display of an advertisement banner at the above Grade II listed property this despite repeated warnings from the Council and letters sent in accordance with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984.

The owner pleaded guilty advising that the advertisement banner had now been removed.

(v) **DENHOLME STORAGE, HALIFAX ROAD, DENHOLME, BRADFORD** **Bingley Rural**

Ongoing enforcement case relating to the above site with the current issue relating to delivery times and hours of operation controlled by planning conditions 4 and 5 of 13/01113/MAF - 12/00699/ENFCOU.

A Breach of Condition Notice was authorised on 24 September 2014 by the Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees).

(vi) **LAND AT CRACK LANE, WILSDEN** **Bingley Rural**

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) had previously authorised the issuing of a Breach of Condition Notice at the above land in connection with the hours of construction - 13/01109/ENFCON.

Further to an investigation the developer of the land Harron Homes Ltd was summonsed to appear at Bradford Magistrates Court on 17 September 2014. The proceedings related to a breach of the hours of construction despite the developer being served with the Breach of Condition Notice. Harron Homes Ltd pleaded guilty to the breach of the condition.

- (vii) **THE GRANGE, WOODFIELD ROAD, CULLINGWORTH, BINGLEY, BD13 5JL** Bingley Rural

Unauthorised two storey outbuilding - 13/00774/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 10 September 2014.

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

NO ACTION

- (h) **DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

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

APPEALS DISMISSED

- (i) **12 ST PHILIPS WAY BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE ILKLEY LS29 7EW** Wharfedale

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 12/00629/ENFAPP

Appeal Ref: 14/00055/APPENF

- (ii) **SECOND FLOOR 17 LAWKHOLME CRESCENT KEIGHLEY BD21 3NR** Keighley Central

Removal of condition 3 of permission 09/03910/FUL allowed on appeal dated 18.8.10: Change of use of top floor from office to taxi control office - Case No: 14/00174/VOC

Appeal Ref: 14/00072/APPVO2

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

NO ACTION

40. **CHAIR'S NOTE**

The Chair advised Members that the Council's Legal Representative, Tim Driver, was leaving the authority. His valuable contribution to the work of the Panel was acknowledged and he was thanked and wished well by all Members in his new employment..

Chair

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

minutes\plks16Oct

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