

# Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley & Shipley) held on Wednesday 22 July 2015 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

Commenced: 1005

Concluded: 1305

**PRESENT – Councillors**

<b>CONSERVATIVE</b>	<b>LABOUR</b>
Miller	Bacon
M Pollard	Farley
	Abid Hussain
	Shabir Hussain

Apologies: Councillor Naylor

Observer: Councillor Poulsen (Minute (5(a)))

**Councillor Shabir Hussain in the Chair**

**5. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

- (a) Councillor Farley disclosed a prejudicial interest in the item relating to 24 Fernbank Avenue, Keighley (Minute 8(b)) as he had previously assisted objectors in relation to this matter. He therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item in accordance with the requirements of the Members’ Code of Conduct (Part 4A of the Constitution) and the Members’ Planning Code of Conduct (Part 4B of the Constitution).
- (b) Councillor Abid Hussain disclosed a prejudicial interest in the item relating to Hawkcliffe Works, Keighley Road, Oxenhope, Keighley (Minute 8(a)) as he had been approached by both the applicant and objectors in respect of the issues. He therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item in accordance with the requirements of the Members’ Code of Conduct (Part 4A of the Constitution) and the Members’ Planning Code of Conduct (Part 4B of the Constitution).
- (c) In the interests of transparency, Councillor Bacon disclosed that, in respect of the item relating to Hawkcliffe Works, Keighley Road, Oxenhope, Keighley (Minute 8 (a)) she was acquainted with one of the objectors to the proposal but she had not discussed the matter with the individual concerned nor made any comment on the matter.



- (d) During the meeting and in the interests of transparency, Councillor Abid Hussain disclosed that, in respect of the item relating to Victoria Hotel, Cavendish Street, Keighley (Minute 8(g)) he had previously been asked for a comment by the local press in respect of this site but he would approach the application with an open mind and consider the material planning issues.

***ACTION: Assistant City Solicitor***

**6. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

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

**7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

**8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS**

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

- (a) **HAWKCLIFFE WORKS, KEIGHLEY ROAD, OXENHOPE, Worth Valley  
KEIGHLEY**

Full planning application for the change of use of B1 Office Premises to a Private Hire Control office - 15/02204/FUL.

The Strategic Director reported the receipt of a letter from the applicant which clarified that the office would only be used for the control of private hire vehicles and would not be a booking office.

In response to questions from a Member of the Panel, he indicated the position of what had been described as a ‘blind bend’ and explained that the allocation of the proposed parking spaces would be by private agreement.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and put forward the following concerns:

- The main objection to the proposal was on the grounds of highway safety.
- The application had changed a number of times and was considered to be contradictory.
- If vehicles drove into the parking spaces in the layby then it would be necessary to reverse out onto a busy road which had severe bends to either side of the site.
- The proposal was considered to be contrary to Policy TM19a of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP).
- The layby was shared parking provision for all users of the mill and this proposal would force others to park on the footway and the road.

- There was concern about conflict with other users of the mill building. Very young children attended karate classes on site and there were shared toilet facilities; if this business had to employ additional staff to accompany children to the toilet it would place a great strain on its future operation.
- A number of residents had not been consulted. There would be an issue with noise due to activity at the site 24 hours a day 7 days a week and this would affect the quality of life of residents particularly the property that backed onto the site.

A representative of the Parish Council made the comments set out below:

- The Parish Council did not object to the principle of a new private hire office but the concern was in relation to the siting at this location.
- There were issues with highway safety; there were two blind bends and the speed limit was 40mph. There had been accidents in the past including one which had been fatal.
- The proposal would lead to an increase in vehicular manoeuvres and the numbers of pedestrians crossing this road as drivers would be highly likely to cross the road to use the facilities on site. In addition there would also be two office staff.
- The proposal would mean the loss of parking for existing users of the building.
- The provision of designated parking bays for this use would limit the space for drivers to turn around and would lead to dangerous manoeuvres in terms of reversing out into the flow of traffic.
- There would be problems if vehicles parked on the apron to the front of the building as visibility was limited on leaving the site.
- There had been an increase in the number of cyclists in the area as a result of the Tour de France.
- Street lights were regularly damaged and out of operation.
- There were no footways.

The Strategic Director said that the parking standards for such a use indicated the provision of five spaces. No objections had been forthcoming from the Council's Highway Development Control officers.

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposal:

- It had taken 12 months for damaged street lights to be replaced.
- The site was only 20 feet from his lounge.
- He had lived in the property for over forty years and considered that this proposal would be severely detrimental to his family's quality of life. There would be activity 24 hours a day 7 days a week with noise generated by doors slamming etc. The area was quiet so all noise would be audible.
- The application referred to a mains sewer but this was a significant distance away. There was a septic tank and this would not cope with additional use on a 24 hours a day, 7 days a week basis.

Representative of two of the businesses located in the mill said that:

- There was a child protection issue. All the staff working with children had to have been subject to the necessary DBS checks (Disclosure and Barring Service) but would the drivers? The toilet facilities were shared so staff would have to accompany children to the toilet. Additional staff would be required and the business would be forced to close.
- The layby was the only place where it was possible for an articulated lorry to park to make deliveries.

The Assistant City Solicitor confirmed that private hire drivers were subject to a DBS check.

The applicant addressed the Panel in support of the application:

- He had been a taxi driver in Keighley and the surrounding areas for over ten years and ran two successful taxi offices
- No drivers or members of the public would visit the office.
- This property was one of the last such buildings in the industrial area of Haworth and the owner was offering incentives for small businesses.
- This was an ideal location for the business.
- There was currently only one taxi office serving seven to eight villages in this area. Also there was a very limited bus service particularly in the evening and at weekends.
- This facility would benefit the people of the area providing a safe, professional, reliable and trustworthy service.
- All the drivers were licensed and had been DBS checked.
- The office door would be kept locked.

Members made the following comments;

- The accommodation appeared extensive for the stated use as it included three sizeable rooms.
- There were difficulties in getting a taxi in the area.
- There were concerns about traffic issues and the potential for problems with lorries in undertaking deliveries; these had not been satisfactorily resolved despite the assurances given.
- It was believed that parking would take place on the adjacent driveway.

In response to Members questions, the Strategic Director said that:

- He was not aware of how much of the mill was occupied.
- The boundary of the nearest dwelling was between 4 to 5 feet from the site and the dwelling itself 20 feet.
- It was considered unlikely that parking would take place on the driveway due to the presence of the layby and also taking into account that the driveway was of single width.
- The illustrative photographs had been undertaken at approximately 16.30.

Members further commented that:

- There were a number of different business uses located in the mill. There would be complaints about parking.
- Having travelled on the road regularly the layby never appeared to be empty and more often than not there had been a large wagon parked there making a delivery.
- This was a very busy road and there were concerns about highway safety.
- It was not necessary to be based in Oxenhope to serve that area.
- The scale of the operation as stated did not appear to be large enough to cover the rental costs and staffing costs that would be payable.
- Reversing onto the highway at this location was a safety concern.

Further to which it was:

**Resolved –**

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

- (i) **The proposed private hire office would lead to an increase in vehicle movements at the site, including vehicles undertaking reversing manoeuvres onto a major road (A6033). It would therefore be detrimental to highway safety contrary to Policy TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**
- (ii) **It is considered that there will be a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of occupiers of nearby properties as a result of the likelihood of private hire vehicle movements and parking taking place on the private drive adjacent to the shared access point, including activity late at night. The proposal would not ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of the land and buildings and would therefore be contrary to Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

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

(b) **24 FERN BANK AVENUE, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley West**

Full planning permission for the demolition of an extension to rear and construction of a single storey extension to the rear and a rear dormer window - 15/01682/HOU.

The Strategic Director responded to questions from Members explaining that there was no space for parking in the front garden/yard at the present time but it would be possible to hard-surface this area and there was also a driveway and a garage.

A representative of the objectors put forward the following points:

- There were a number of objectors to the application.
- This proposal was introducing a commercial venture into a quiet residential area.
- If the issue of the building work being undertaken had not been raised by residents nothing would have been done.
- The main concern was parking; there had been considerable congestion whilst the work had been taking place.
- The property was sited on a very tight corner. Fern Bank Avenue was also on a significant gradient.
- There would be access problems for emergency vehicles and refuse collection vehicles.
- The developer should construct an area suitable for off-street parking for visitors.
- There would be visits by relatives, medical staff and deliveries. Local residents did not want parking to take place outside their homes.
- The road was only 6 metres wide.
- If vehicles parked on the pavement it caused obstruction for people with pushchairs or who were visually impaired.

- If the application was approved then additional parking should be created to alleviate the problems. Signs could also be displayed to indicate to visitors where they should park.
- This was a residential area and the majority of people were elderly with some being infirm.

The Strategic Director said that the applicant had stated that there would be a staff member on site and they would be able to resolve any issues with parking. It was not anticipated that it would be a problem but if it was then an increase in provision could be considered.

The Assistant City Solicitor said that the imposition of a condition to require the provision of extra parking could not be considered appropriate as any conditions must relate directly to the application which, in this case, was just for an extension to the property and not associated with the proposed use. It could not be said that the construction of an extension and a dormer window would in themselves cause additional parking.

Members commented that:

- The parking was an issue in light of the fact that it was not a dwelling for one family unit.
- The retrospective nature of the application was a concern; the applicant was a property company which should be aware of the regulations governing planning.
- Regardless of the retrospective nature of the application the issue for consideration was whether the works caused demonstrable harm.
- The matter before the Panel for consideration was for a rear extension and a dormer window not the use.
- There were no planning reasons to refuse the application.

The Strategic Director undertook to convey to the applicant the Panel's concern in respect of the application having been submitted retrospectively.

**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) **73 MAIN STREET, BINGLEY**

**Bingley**

Change of use application to convert a Class A1 retail shop to a Class A4 drinking establishment - 15/02022/FUL.

The Strategic Director reported on the substance of a letter received from the local Member of Parliament further to the publication of his report.

He also explained that:

- The previous application (in April 2015) had been refused under delegated powers due to a lack of information and the flat above being in residential use, which was no longer the case. A number of other material changes and further information submitted by the applicant (including proposals for acoustic insulation of the property and restrictions on the use of the back yard) were set out in his report.

- The issues raised by objectors had been considered by the Environmental Health department and no objections had been raised. The Environmental Health officer had confirmed that this was still the case having revisited the rear of the site in response to further objections from neighbours.
- The proposal would have to satisfy other regulatory regimes prior to becoming operational.
- The Ward Councillor's comments were set out in the report.

An objector to the application detailed the following arguments against the change of use:

- The proposal would have an adverse impact on the local environment contrary to Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) as it would lead to an increase in noise and nuisance for residents and businesses.
- Customers would congregate outside the premises, particularly in the Summer months, as happened at other such establishments.
- The change of use would lead to anti-social behaviour outside; there had been numerous such incidents in the town centre in 2014 the majority of which had been alcohol related.
- The use would cause noise when bottles were tipped and collected.
- The fire exit would be used other than in emergency situations.
- There were inadequate facilities for smokers which would lead to use of the pavement, the intimidation of customers of the adjacent shop and the disposal of cigarette stubs and litter. There could also be damage to property.
- The adjacent alleyway had been used as a urinal in the past even if it had been locked.
- The proposal would lead to a loss of residential accommodation.
- It was considered that the scheme was contrary to Policy CT1 of the RUDP; the Bingley Town Centre vision stated that the current shopping offer was fragile and that retail space had declined.
- There were eleven public houses on, or close to, Main Street already.
- There was a need for more balance with retail uses.
- He had been trading from this location for 18 years. It was not considered that the existing daytime businesses were paid due regard and also that residents were being forced out.
- The Panel was urged to reject the application

The applicant was also present at the meeting. He said that:

- He understood the objections that had been made.
- The use would be as a small micro pub serving locally brewed cask ales which would help to support a new Bingley brewery.
- Bottles would not be sold.
- The hours of operation were likely to be less than suggested by the planning condition.

In response to Members' questions the Strategic Director explained that:

- The issue of emergency access would be an element for consideration under the Building Regulations. It was considered likely however that all access/egress would be via the front and back doors.
- It was accepted that the wording of the refusal of the application in April 2015 could be considered somewhat confusing but, at that stage, it had not been clear what the intention was in respect of the back yard area and there had been a residential use both above this unit and the adjacent property. There was now no residential use directly above the unit and insulation was to be provided between the properties.

Members made the following comments:

- This was a very small venture.
- This used to be a busy shopping area; it might help to have something different.
- There were already larger public houses in the vicinity.
- The applicant would also have to satisfy Building Regulations and the licensing requirements.

**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***

(d) **76 WHEATLEY LANE, ILKLEY**

**Ilkley**

Householder planning application for external and internal modifications; including increasing the height and modification of the roof; a front gable extension and alterations to the bay window; removal of existing double garage and the construction of a single storey side extension - 15/01676/HOU

In response to a question from a Panel Member the Strategic Director indicated the position of all the protected trees. These were concentrated, in the main, along the west and rear boundaries of the site and were part of an established group.

A resident of Margerison Crescent addressed the Panel to outline the following concerns:

- The planning officer had suggested that there would be insignificant impact from overshadowing but there was a small area where he could currently sit in the morning and enjoy the sun and this development would mean that this was not possible for six months of the year.
- There would be months of the year when the impact was even greater than shown on the submitted illustrations.
- The development would lead to a loss of amenity.
- There were also issues in respect of privacy as, essentially, a third floor was being added to the property increasing the height by approximately 1.5 metres. This would lead to overlooking as well as overshadowing.

The Strategic Director explained that the objector’s property was already naturally overshadowed in the winter months so the issue for consideration was the impact of the additional height. During the winter months any impact between the hours of 0930 and 1100 was considered not so significant as to warrant refusal.

Members considered that, on balance, there was no reason to refuse the application; it was an extension to an existing building which would have an impact only for a short period of time in the winter.

**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) **LAND ADJACENT TO ELECTRICITY SUB-STATION,  
WEST VIEW ROAD, BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE**

Wharfedale

Outline planning permission for two semi detached houses - 15/01683/OUT.

It was reported that the application was before the Panel as it had been submitted by the Council. No representations had been received.

**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) **LAND TO THE SOUTH OF 112 BRADFORD ROAD,  
MENSTON, ILKLEY**

Wharfedale

Full planning application for a mixed use development comprising a retail convenience store and four residential apartments with new pedestrian and vehicular accesses and landscaping - 15/01024/FUL.

The Strategic Director explained that a number of further objections had been received after the publication of his technical report and he reported on the substance of the issues raised therein.

A Parish Councillor made the following comments:

- The proposal did not accord with the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Residential use was preferable, as had been approved previously.
- There was no need for a supermarket; there were a number in close proximity and people would not walk to this site. Residents of Menston would either walk to the local Co-op or drive.
- The junctions in the vicinity were very busy. The egress would lead to vehicles turning across traffic whilst waiting on an upward slope.
- The A65 was very busy and dangerous and the Parish Council was not convinced that the highway improvements would resolve the issues.
- The crossing would be noisy for local residents.
- A previous proposal had been refused as a result of concern expressed by the Highway’s officer; it was questioned how this scheme was different apart from the provision of a pedestrian crossing.
- The bus stop would have more impact if located elsewhere.
- The layby would be full and delivery vehicles unable to park.
- People would park on Barrowby Close and cross the road.
- There were no proposals to address drainage, Mire Beck ran alongside the site.

The Assistant City Solicitor explained that the Neighbourhood Plan only had limited weight at this point as it had not yet been advertised.

The Strategic Director stated that:

- A condition required the submission of a detailed drainage scheme.

- There had been detailed consultations undertaken in respect of the highway arrangements and all the highway officer's concerns had been addressed. The parking provision on the site met the Council's standards.

A local resident detailed the following objections to the development:

- He lived directly opposite the site and had done so for 15 years.
- The A65 was a very busy road sometimes free flowing with fast traffic and sometimes very congested.
- Egress from Barrowby Close was already difficult and dangerous and this would be exacerbated by the additional traffic, including delivery vehicles, generated by this development.
- The site was in close proximity to a school and also to an ambulance station with the potential for emergency vehicles travelling at high speed.
- Parking was a huge issue in the area.
- Insufficient provision meant that vehicles would park on the A65 or on Barrowby Close causing nuisance.
- The pedestrian crossing would be placed right outside properties causing annoyance and exacerbating delays and congestion.
- Asking drivers to be quiet and not to rev their engines would not address the issues.
- The number of vehicles would lead to issues with noise, disturbance and light pollution.
- Would early morning and late night deliveries be permitted?
- A commercial use on this site was not appropriate; residential use would make far more sense. This was a predominantly residential area apart from a couple of uses nearby.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposal as follows:

- The officer's report provided a full assessment of the application.
- The original mixed use development application had been withdrawn, rather than refused, due to issues with the trees and highway concerns. The proposal had now been amended significantly to address these issues.
- There was a commercial use immediately adjacent to the site and other commercial properties both to the North and the South.
- Objections had been received to the original proposal in respect of problems in crossing the road but objections had been made to the current proposal on the basis that a 'puffin' crossing was included.
- A delivery management plan would be put into place to ensure that drivers did not cause conflict; this was a standard procedure. The end user of the retail unit wished to be a good neighbour.
- The pedestrian crossing would create gaps in traffic on the A65 assisting people turning right into the village to the North of the site.
- The level of parking provision had been based on surveys of the levels required across the country.
- The store would be a small convenience store, under 400m<sup>2</sup>, and it was considered that some customers would visit on foot.
- The applicant had worked with the highways officer to address any safety issues.

In response to further questions the Strategic Director said that:

- There was some flexibility in respect of the exact position of the pedestrian crossing; the submitted plan was indicative to illustrate that it was feasible for one to be provided. A detailed plan would be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority.

- The question of need for the retail unit was addressed within the report; there was an increasing level of housing in the area, surveys of similar provision had been undertaken and the existence of a catchment to support the use was considered to have been demonstrated. The site was currently vacant and available and the scale of the proposed unit was not considered to have an adverse effect upon existing facilities.
- The level of parking provision normally required for such units was 1 space for 14m<sup>2</sup> although a recent survey had resulted in the accepted professional opinion being that 1 for 20m<sup>2</sup> was a more reasonable expectation.
- A clause in respect of the permitted hours of delivery would be included within the Delivery Management Plan but could be the subject of a further specific condition if Members considered this to be appropriate.

A Member commented that the facility would offer local residents the opportunity to walk to the local shop instead of having to use the car.

**Resolved –**

- (1) **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 together with an additional condition relating to:**

**No deliveries to be permitted between the hours of 2200 and 0600.**

- (2) **That the grant of planning permission be subject also to the completion of a legal planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990/Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, or such other lawful mechanism for securing the heads of terms as may be agreed in consultation with the City Solicitor, in respect of:**

**The undertaking of associated highway improvement works, to include:**

- (i) **The construction of a 'PUFFIN' crossing and all associated signage, including two vehicle activated signs.**
- (ii) **Relocation of the existing bus stop**
- (iii) **Implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order along the site frontage on Bradford Road, to prohibit parking.**
- (iv) **The construction of a servicing lay-by, in accordance with the approved plans.**
- (v) **The installation of drop down bollards to protect the residential parking spaces located within the site.**
- (vi) **A commitment to the submitted Service/Delivery Management Plan by the developer and all subsequent retail operators,**

**the legal planning obligation to contain such other ancillary provisions as the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture (after consultation with the City Solicitor) considers appropriate.**

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

- (g) **VICTORIA HOTEL, CAVENDISH STREET, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley  
Central**

Full application for conversion of existing public house and hotel into 4 retail units on the ground floor with associated external changes and the creation of 9 self-contained units - 15/01468/FUL.

The Strategic Director explained that, further to the deferral of this application, at the meeting of the Panel held on 29 June 2015, in order that officers might consult the applicant about the issue of bin storage, a better bin storage arrangement had now been achieved that would allow for 4 of the largest bins or up to 18 standard bins.

He confirmed, in response to a Member's question, that the layout would allow for provision for recycling.

**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***

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

**(i) 17 Whitlam Street, Saltaire, Shipley Shipley**

Alleged breach of planning control in respect of the installation of a new top opening window to the front of the property - 14/00580/ENFLBC.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) had authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice, under delegated powers, on 12 February 2015.

**(ii) 28 Oberon Way, Cottingley, Bingley Bingley Rural**

Alleged breach of planning control in respect of the construction of a first floor balcony - 13/00615/ENFUNA.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) had authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice, under delegated powers, on 9 June 2015.

**(iii) Land at 49 Cliffe Street, Keighley Keighley Central**

Alleged breach of planning control in respect of the construction of white UPVC clad dormer windows to the front and rear elevations of the property - 14/00851/ENFAPP.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) had authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice, under delegated powers, on 17 June 2015.

**(iv) 55 Bingley Road, Saltaire, Shipley Shipley**

Alleged breach of planning control in respect of the rendering of a chimney on a Grade II listed building located within the Saltaire World Heritage Site - 14/00820/ENFLBC.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) had authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice, under delegated powers, on 25 June 2015.

(v) **73 Grafton Road, Keighley**

**Keighley  
Central**

Alleged breach of planning control in respect of the construction of white UPVC clad dormer windows to the front and rear elevations - 13/00519/ENFUNA.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) had authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice, under delegated powers, on 17 June 2015.

**Resolved –**

**That the reports be noted.**

***NO ACTION***

(i) **DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

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

**APPEALS ALLOWED**

(i) **14 Progress Avenue, Harden, Bingley**

**Bingley Rural**

Two storey side extension - Case No: 14/04765/HOU,  
Appeal Ref: 15/00043/APPHOU.

(ii) **Steeton Football Ground, Summerhill Lane,  
Steeton with Eastburn**

**Craven**

Advertising boards fixed to pitch-side perimeter fencing (retrospective) –  
Case No: 14/03890/ADV, Appeal Ref: 15/00005/APPCN2.

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

(iii) **Westfield Farm, Tim Lane, Oakworth, Keighley**

**Worth Valley**

Change of use of agricultural building and land to residential use  
with associated alterations and partial demolition - Case No: 14/02019/PAR,  
Appeal Ref: 15/00014/APPPN2.

**Resolved –**

**That the decisions be noted.**

***NO ACTION***

Chair

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

i:\minutes\plks22July