

# City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

www.bradford.gov.uk

(mins.dot)

## Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley) held on Wednesday 23 February 2011 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 1005  
Site Visit 1230 - 1325  
Concluded 1341

### PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR
Byrom	Lee
Gibbons	Abid Hussain
L'Amie	Dredge

Apologies: Councillors Clamp and Greaves

### Councillor Lee in the Chair

#### 63. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

No disclosures of interest in matters under consideration were received.

#### 64. MINUTES

##### Resolved -

That the minutes of the meetings of the Panel held on 9 December 2010 and 19 January 2011, be signed as a correct record.

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

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



Suzan Hemingway - City Solicitor

**66. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

**67. 81 WESLEY PLACE, HALIFAX ROAD, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley East**

Full application for subdivision of existing dwelling into 2 dwelling units and conversion of a workshop building to a third dwelling at 81 Wesley Place, Halifax Road, Keighley - 10/04375/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Keighley Town Council had objected to the application on highway grounds. No representations had been received in respect of the application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the proposal would make more effective use of the land for housing. The site was in an accessible location being on a frequent bus service and comprising land that was already developed and a building that had previously been in use for commercial purposes. The proposals would have no adverse effects on local amenity or on the amenity of occupiers of any neighbouring properties. The proposals for access had been amended and it was considered that the scheme was provided with satisfactory arrangements for access/egress and car parking such that the scheme would not result in any harm to local highway safety. The proposals were considered acceptable having regard to Policies UR3, D1, TM2, TM12 and TM19A of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to the conditions as outlined in Document "P".

Members made the following comments:

- Would the telegraph pole be retained as it would obscure the view?
- Would there be a car parking space?
- Does the outbuilding have permission for industrial use? If it does have permission for industrial use then it could have a lot more cars using the location.

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

- He was surprised that on the officer presentation photographs the road was shown as having no traffic as it was the main road to Halifax.
- It was a busy main road in Keighley and there could be an accident during peak times.

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

- It was a good location for the development.
- There would be car parking space available.
- The photograph had been taken at 11 am.
- The outbuilding does have permission for industrial use.

**Resolved –**

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

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

**Decision Following Site Visit**

**68. COW AND CALF CAFÉ, COW AND CALF ROCKS,  
HANGINGSTONE ROAD, ILKLEY**

**Ilkley**

Full application for the demolition of the existing Yorkshire Water building and refreshment kiosk and construction of a replacement building to house cafe, moorland information display and public toilets at Cow and Calf Rocks, Hangingstone Road, Ilkley – Departure from the Replacement Unitary Development Plan -10/03907/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that the application was referred to the Area Planning Panel so that it could advise the Regulatory and Appeals Committee on the local implications of the application. The application must be determined by the Regulatory and Appeals Committee as it was a departure from the replacement unitary development plan.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that Ilkley Parish Council had recommended approval of the application. It was considered that the benefits arising from the provision of improved visitor facilities at this important tourist destination, including the provision of public toilets, would outweigh any harm to the openness of the Green Belt and amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the development in this location. To ensure that these “very special circumstances” were fulfilled, it would be necessary for the applicant to enter into an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act to secure a suitable scheme management of the facility by the developer and subsequent operators to incorporate arrangements to secure availability and access to the toilet facilities; hours of operation; availability of outdoor seating for non-customers. It would need to ensure that the Council and other organisations were able to use the facility for the occasional display of educational and interpretive material relating to Rombalds Moor.

It was also proposed to impose a condition to ensure that the building hereby approved should be used only for purposes of a new visitors' centre/cafe with public toilet facilities as shown on the approved submitted plans and for no other purpose (including any other activity, such as a restaurant, within Class A3 of the Order). He therefore suggested that it be recommended to the Regulatory and Appeals Committee to grant planning permission subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement.

Members made the following comments:

- Wouldn't cedar wood be more appropriate?
- Was the lack of trees on the Moor due to climate or was it difficult for them to grow

there or did sheep prevent the trees from growing.

- It was agreed that a site visit should take place.
- If you were travelling by car on the left hand side of the road there would be loss of view of Calf Cow at that point and this was a lot of people's entry route to Ilkley.

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

- A two storey café was not needed as you already have Calf Cow.
- There were public concerns and strong reservations about the application and the proposal to remove four trees.
- There was no reason why the existing building could not be extended.
- The development would be too dominant.
- There was no need for the first floor of the building as it would dominate as it was set against the Moor.
- All of the existing tree screen would be lost.
- This was common land and there were other issues apart from commercial concerns.
- It was in the green belt.
- There was no real need for the development.
- It would be a blot on the landscape.
- There should be a site visit and the application should be rejected.
- It would be dangerous for people coming off the Moor.

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

- Following experience with use of Cedar materials the materials would need to be neutral, as timber might stand out.
- It was necessary to have only a limited number of trees on the Moor as the management approach was to keep the Moor open.
- There was a need for this facility as it was a prime visitor centre in the Bradford district and could add to the visitor experience.
- He understood the points made by the Ward Councillor, it was a sensitive location and it had been dealt with correctly.
- The applicant had first approached the Council in 2007 and it had not been a hurried application.
- It would be 5.6 metres at highest point above ground and was not like a house but was more bungalow sized.
- There would be a meeting space hidden in the roof of the building.
- There were a lot of similar centres in countryside locations.
- The applicant had looked at extending the existing building but would be able to get more from a new build.

After a site visit Members made the following comments:

- Since I have lived in Ilkley no-one has complained about lack of toilet facilities.
- The development could in future be turned into a restaurant and car parking problems might arise.
- It was too big.
- It was too high.
- Special circumstances had not been established for the nature and scale of the development and there were concerns in respect of height, visual impact and

- materials to be used.
- It would be detrimental to traffic and pedestrian safety.
- It was a poor design and would constitute overdevelopment.
- It would be a blot on the landscape.

**Resolved –**

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

**The development would be situated in an area designated as Green Belt by the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District and would constitute inappropriate development. It is not considered that very special circumstances exist sufficient to justify the harm that will be caused to the Green Belt by virtue of the nature of the development and its excessive height and scale. Furthermore, it is considered that the size, height and materials would have a detrimental effect on the character of the important landscape surrounding the site. The development would be inappropriate development contrary to Policy GB1 of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan and national planning guidance in PPG2 : Green Belts.**

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

**69. NAPPA HOUSE, 37 SCOTT LANE, RIDDLEDEN, KEIGHLEY Keighley East**

Two storey extension and decking to the rear and a single storey extension to the front of 37 Scott Lane, Riddlesden, Keighley – 10/05851/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Keighley Town Council had recommended refusal on the grounds of overdevelopment and taking light from the neighbouring house. No representations had been received in respect of this application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the proposed two storey extension, single storey extension and decking to the rear were considered to relate satisfactorily to the character of the existing dwelling and adjacent properties. The impact of the proposal upon the occupants of neighbouring properties had been assessed and it was considered that it would not have a significant adverse effect upon their residential amenity. As such this proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policies UR3 (The Local Impact of Development) and D1 (General Design Considerations) of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2005 and the supplementary planning guidance contained within the Council's Revised House Extensions Policy 2003. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions as outlined in Document "P".

Members made the following comments:

- All along the canal the houses were different.
- What was the measurement of the double extension at the back?

A Town Councillor was present at the meeting and reported that the drawings had been altered and that the Parish Council now had no objections to the application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture confirmed that from the front to the back of the house the measurement was 3.3 metres.

**Resolved –**

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

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

**70. 6 – 8 CAVENDISH STREET, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley Central**

Full planning application for change of use of A1 retail outlet to an A5 hot food outlet and installation of external air con/cold room condensers at 6 - 8 Cavendish Street, Keighley – 10/04495/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Keighley Town Council had recommended refusal of the application as the proposal would be out of keeping with the rest of Cavendish Street. Three representations of objection had been received. A summary of representations received were as outlined in Document "P". The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture recommended refusal of the application for reasons as outlined in Document "P".

Members made the following comments:

- How long had the property been void?
- There was a facility for parking cars.
- Parking problems were bad in the area.
- The impact of two empty shops on Cavendish Street should be taken into consideration.
- It should not go against the Council's own regulations.
- Cavendish Street looks to be terminally ill, we may well need to reconsider the purpose and role of high streets.
- There would be a problem if a large illuminated sign was put up.
- Cavendish Street was a nice upmarket street and to see an illuminated bright red "Chicken Cottage" sign was not in keeping with the surroundings.
- The back of Cavendish Street was a mess.
- Was non-retail use acceptable?
- Details should be submitted to the Council in respect of the colour and finish of the proposed wall mounted condenser units to be installed on the rear elevation.
- Prior to the commencement of development, details of a scheme for the visual improvement of the rear elevation and the rear yard of the premises should be submitted to the Council.
- The premises should not be used for the approved purpose until details of proposed measures for controlling kitchen extract emissions had been submitted to and approved by the Council.
- The town needs the business but does it need it in a conservation area?
- As it was a listed building we could ask for more appropriate signage.

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

- The original shop was done without planning permission and it had taken four years to take them to court.
- There were parking issues involved in this matter.
- It was near to a crossing.
- It would spoil the look of the parade.
- There was a massive chimney and extractor along the wall.

The landlord for the property was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- There was an issue of how long the property had been vacant as it had been vacant since December 2009.
- Very little interest had been expressed in the property and it had previously been occupied by Victoria Wine.
- In recent years the property had struggled to find a tenant that could make a long-term success of conventional retailing.
- It had been occupied for six months only and the retailer had gone out of business.
- For over a year now this has been a blank frontage and as such a blight for surrounding trades and shoppers alike.
- What was better, an empty shop or a vibrant new use.
- The first floor kitchen was not a habitable room.
- A vibrant new occupation would liven up that end of the street to everyone's advantage.
- Chicken Cottage was a high quality national franchise, they were high quality food restaurants operating to the highest standards.
- The applicants were a local family with deep roots in Keighley and with a commitment to invest.
- It would generate jobs and secure a viable use for a shop in this heritage location.
- This application fully meets the objectives of Chapter 7 of the RUDP overall.
- Any issues relating to ventilation and signage should be resolved by negotiation with council officers.

A letter from a Director of the company marketing the property made the following points:

- Demand for retail opportunity of this type in Keighley was very limited and sadly not expected to improve.
- In view of the location of the subject a significant negative impact on the overall balance of retail and non-retail uses was not anticipated as the parade was prominently weighted towards A1 retail in any event and the subject would create an end/corner site.
- The applicant we understand intends to spend a significant amount on fit-out of the premises. This combined with intelligent control should mean that the effects on the character setting of the listed building would not be affected in a negative way.
- Intelligent application, design, control and policing should deal with any environmental health concerns.

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

- There was a difference between takeaways and what we were doing.
- There were not many small retailers that could afford to rent two shops.

- It was a cross between a restaurant and a takeaway.
- We want to have a better reputation in respect of fast food.
- We would have 30 seats in our establishment and we expect people to eat in.
- We have spent £250,000 on this project.

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

- Cavendish Street was terminally declining and the retail sector was suffering.
- Any odour smells would be controlled by new technology.
- Keighley needs this investment.

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

- Objections received had been in respect of litter and it was claimed that the issue would get worse with another takeaway nearby. It would be difficult to disperse the cooking oil.
- In respect of noise level it would only be acceptable with the windows closed.
- A conservation officer was concerned about the application.
- On balance the recommendation was to refuse the application and he agreed with the concerns of the Town Council.
- We need to find appropriate uses for this area.
- We have no idea why the property has been empty for so long.
- There were highway issues in respect of parking.
- Environmental health officers had stated that the technology to be used was innovative and the manufacturers had said that it would be 85% effective.
- The white extractor would be removed and it could be a condition that the two new extractors could be asked to match the building.
- There would be no illuminated sign.

**Resolved –**

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

**1. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the colour and finish of the proposed wall mounted condenser units to be installed on the rear elevation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The premises shall not be brought into use for the approved purpose until the existing aircon condenser unit and all associated support brackets and fittings have been removed from the rear elevation and the new condensers shall be installed and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details of colour and finish.**

**Reason :** In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and the character of the listed building and to accord with Policies D1, BH4 and BH4A of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

**2. Prior to the commencement of development, details of a scheme for the visual improvement of the rear elevation and the rear yard of the premises shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include a plan showing the location of the proposed bin store area. The premises shall not be brought into use for the approved purpose until the bin storage area and other measures so approved have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.**



**Reason :** In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and the character of the listed building and to accord with Policies D1, BH4 and BH4A of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

**3.** The premises the subject of this decision shall not be open for business between the hours of 23.00 and 09.00 hours from Monday to Saturday and between the hours of 22.00 and 09.00 on Sundays. No customer shall be served or otherwise make use of the premises between these hours.

**Reason:** In order to safeguard the amenity of nearby residents and to accord with Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

**4.** Notwithstanding details provided with the application submission, the premises shall not be used for the approved purpose until details of proposed measures for controlling kitchen extract emissions have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include measures for maintenance of the proposed extract equipment and proposals for dealing with residual odour that may affect the amenity of nearby occupiers. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.

**Reason :** To safeguard the amenity of occupiers of nearby residential premises and to accord with Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

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

**71. 6 – 8 CAVENDISH STREET, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley Central**

Listed Building Consent application for change of use of A1 retail outlet to an A5 hot food outlet and installation of external air con/cold room condensers at 6-8 Cavendish Street, Keighley – 10/04496/LBC.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that Keighley Town Council had recommended refusal of the application as it would be out of keeping with the rest of Cavendish Street. He recommended refusal of the application for listed building consent as the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building due to the impact of the air conditioning/condenser units on the rear elevation. In addition, there was inadequate information submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposed kitchen extract system would effectively disperse cooking odours and that the A5 use could be introduced without the necessity for additional intrusive flues or ducting having to be fixed to the building. This would adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings comprising the application premises and the rest of Cavendish Street and would be contrary to Policies BH4, BH4A and D1 of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

The landlord of the premises, the applicant and the Ward Councillor were present at the meeting and made a number of points (see Minute 70).

Members also made comments (see Minute 70).

**Resolved –**

**That the application for Listed Building Consent be approved subject to the following conditions:**

**1. Notwithstanding details shown on the approved plans, the proposed fascia signs to be installed on the premises shall comprise of a painted timber panel, not extruded aluminium. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the colour and finish of the proposed signage shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the new signs shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason : In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and the character of the listed building and to accord with Policies D1, BH4 and BH4A of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**

**2. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the colour and finish of the proposed wall mounted condenser units to be installed on the rear elevation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The premises shall not be brought into use for the approved purpose until the existing aircon condenser unit and all associated support brackets and fittings shall be removed from the rear elevation and the new condensers shall be installed and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details of colour and finish.**

**Reason : In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and the character of the listed building and to accord with Policies D1, BH4 and BH4A of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**

**3. Prior to the commencement of development, details of a scheme for the visual improvement of the rear elevation and the rear yard of the premises shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include a plan showing the location of the proposed bin store area. The premises shall not be brought into use for the approved purpose until the bin storage area and other measures so approved have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason : In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and the character of the listed building and to accord with Policies D1, BH4 and BH4A of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan.**

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

**72. LAND SOUTH WEST OF HAMILTON VIEW, HEBDEN BRIDGE Worth Valley  
ROAD, OXENHOPE**

Full application for the construction of a detached house on land to the south west of Hamilton View, Hebden Bridge Road, Oxenhope – 10/05859/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that the application was for the construction of a detached house and did include a double garage. Oxenhope Parish Council had objected to the application for the reasons as outlined in

Document "P". The Council had received six letters objecting to the proposal and a Ward Councillor had sent a representation in support. The summary of representations received were as outlined in Document "P".

The Assistant Director, Regeneration and Culture recommended that the application be refused for the reasons as outlined in Document "P".

Members made the following comments:

- Did we know that the field would soak up the water?

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

- The Parish Council was familiar with this application as there had been much public discussion about it since 1996.
- He thanked planners for the details that they had provided.
- His major concerns were different from planners and it was related to the importance of the site as it was the fundamental setting of the village church.
- This issue had been covered in the conservation area assessment that had been provided.
- It was a village green space and was adopted by Bradford District Council.
- The loss of space has been identified by the Oxenhope Village Design Statement.
- The development would be detrimental to the area.

A member of the Church Council was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- Everyone was opposed to this application except the applicant and the Ward Councillor.
- The Ward Councillor had said that the development was approved on Church Street and that it was not near to the church, this was not the case.
- This site was vital for the church which was an early Norman style church which was listed in the National Walks Guide.
- We were not Nimbys but just enjoyed the view of the church.

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

- The land provides a valuable view of the area.
- The view had often been used on calendars.
- This was an important issue and the application had not received any support from the Town Council.
- Once space was lost it was lost for ever.

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

- This application was irrespective of the dismissal of the previous application for the dwelling.
- It was not correct that the application had previously been refused on highway grounds.
- The planning inspector had not shared the Council's concern in respect of the impact on trees and there was no reason to object on these grounds.
- The applicant had done a transport assessment and there were no objections.
- Alterations had widened the gap in respect of the development.

- In respect of drainage there were no detailed proposals submitted.
- There were only six letters of objection which showed that there were not many persons against the application.
- He recommended that the Panel should support this revised application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture confirmed that no details had been received in respect of drainage.

**Resolved –**

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

**1. The development by reason of its siting, layout, scale, size, massing and design will introduce an intrusive building in a prominent location and result in the loss of an open space identified in the Conservation Area Assessment as a key open space. The open space provided by the site is considered to make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the Upper Town Conservation Area, providing an attractive setting for the buildings within it, being of importance to the historical form and layout of the settlement and affording the opportunity for important vistas into and out of the Conservation Area. Consequently it is considered that the development will adversely affect the character and appearance of Upper Town Conservation Area contrary to Policies BH7, OS8 and BH10 of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2005) and national guidance in PPS5.**

**2. The development will introduce an intrusive building in a visually prominent location and will result in the loss of an open space considered to make a significant contribution to the setting of the nearby Grade II listed building St Mary's Church and which affords the opportunity for important vistas of the church from Hebden Bridge Road. The development will dominate views of the listed church from Hebden Bridge Road and will adversely affect its semi-rural setting. Consequently it is considered that the development will adversely affect the special interest and setting of the Grade II listed St Mary's Church contrary to Policy BH4A of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2005) and PPS5.**

**3. The development is considered to provide insufficient information to demonstrate that it will not harm the tree roots of mature trees on the site that are of significant visual amenity value, these trees are an integral part of the setting of a listed building and contribute to the character and appearance of Oxenhope Upper Town Conservation Area. The plans are not considered to accurately plot the siting and size of the trees within the site and insufficient information has been submitted to properly assess the effect of the development on the trees. The potential for an adverse impact on trees is contrary to Policies UR3, NE4 and NE5 and NE6 of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2005).**

**4. West Croft Head and its junction with Hebden Bridge Road are already substandard and the proposed development will intensify the use of this access road. The proposal fails to meet an acceptable level of safety to meet the intensification of use due to the substandard junction layout, visibility, width and lack of a turning area and so the development would be contrary to Policies TM2 and TM19A of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2005).**

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

**73. ENFORCEMENT ENQUIRIES CLOSED BY THE PLANNING MANAGER  
(ENFORCEMENT & TREES)/SENIOR ENFORCEMENT OFFICER  
AS NOT EXPEDIENT TO PURSUE**

**(i) 31 Hillcrest Avenue, Silsden Craven**

Wall and gate exceed one metre in height alongside highway by approximately 300mm – 10/01317/ENFUNA.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 5 January 2011.

**(ii) 4A Belmont Road, Ilkley Ilkley**

Small timber shed placed to one side of access drive to dwelling. Screened from Belmont Road by neighbours large conifer hedge – 10/01059/ENFUNA.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 19 January 2011.

**(iii) 8 Laurel Crescent, Belgrave Road, Keighley Keighley Central**

Two satellite dishes to front of property. Both are standard diameter and one is located at low level and attached to dividing garden wall – 10/01427/ENFUNA.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 26 January 2011.

**(iv) Recreation Ground, Stockinger Lane, Addingham Craven**

Temporary sign advertising development erected on land adjoining property. – 10/01362/ENFADV.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 5 January 2011.

**Resolved –**

**That the report be noted.**

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

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

**Appeals Allowed**

**(i) 174 Highfield Lane, Keighley Keighley Central**

Retrospective application for single storey rear extension - Case No: 10/03366/HOU

Appeal Ref: 10/00213/APPHOU

**(ii) Annex Highfield House, Hangingstone Road, Ilkley Ilkley**

Reconstruction of hostel building and re-use as residential annex – Case No: 7/09652/FUL

Appeal Ref: 08/00230/APPFUL

(iii) **Barrows House, 16 Barrows Lane, Steeton  
With Eastburn**

**Craven**

Renewal of planning approval 04/05554/FUL dated 15/07/05: New driveway  
- Case No: 10/03301/HOU

Appeal Ref: 10/00214/APPHOU

**Appeals Dismissed**

(iv) **11 Glenhurst Drive, Keighley**

**Keighley East**

Construction of double garage in place of previously demolished garage - Case No:  
10/04540/HOU

Appeal Ref: 10/00232/APPHOU

(v) **3 Park Way, Menston, Ilkley**

**Wharfedale**

Single storey extension to side. Dormers/new velux windows to roof internal alterations. -  
Case No: 10/03751/HOU

Appeal Ref: 10/00234/APPHOU

**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 Committee.**

minutes\plk23feb

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