

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Shipley) held on Wednesday 10 March 2010 at the Town Hall, Shipley

Commenced 1010
Adjourned 1050
Reconvened 1110
Concluded 1330

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
Greaves	Amin	Cole
Owens	Ferriby	
Pennington		

Apologies: Councillor Shabir Hussain

Councillor Owens in the Chair

39. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Ferriby disclosed a personal interest in the items relating to Bank Top Farm, Rosedale Close, Baildon (Minute 42(a)), Land adjacent to Cleasby Court, Kirklands Close, Menston, Ilkley (Minute 42(b)), Manywells Industrial Estate, Manywells Brow, Cullingworth, Bingley (Minute 42 (c)), 30 Main Street, Burley in Wharfedale, Ilkley (Minute 42(e)) and The Stone Yard, Derry Hill, Menston, Ilkley (Minute 42(f)) as she was the Chair of the Green Space Network in Bradford South and as the interest was not prejudicial she remained in the meeting.

Councillor Greaves disclosed a personal interest in the item relating to Land adjacent to Cleasby Court, Kirklands Close, Menston, Ilkley (Minute 42(b)) as he was acquainted with the objector and as the interest was not prejudicial he remained in the meeting.

Action: *Assistant Director, Corporate Services (City Solicitor)*

40. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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



2006-2007
Improving Rural Services
Empowering Communities



Suzan Hemingway, Assistant Director Corporate Services (City Solicitor)



41. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.

42. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS

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

(a) **Bank Top Farm, Rosedale Close, Baildon**

Baildon

Full application for the construction a detached dwelling within the curtilage of Bank Top Farm, Baildon - 09/05882/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. It was explained that the proposal was to construct a detached dwelling within the curtilage of Bank Top Farm with access from Rosedale Close. Previous applications for a dwelling in the front garden and to the rear of the farm had been refused due to the detrimental impact on neighbours' amenity. Nine letters of representation from local residents had been received on the grounds of overbearing, loss of light and parking, out of scale and character, disturbance during construction and harmful to neighbouring amenity. Two Ward Councillors had also raised objections and requested that the Panel determined the application. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that consultations had been undertaken with the Council's Design and Conservation, Drainage, Rights of Way and Trees Teams. The Trees Team had stated that they could not support the application as the trees would cast a shadow on the proposed dwelling, therefore placing pressure on their removal. It was noted that endeavours had been made to overcome the previous reasons for refusal and the amendments satisfactorily dealt with and resolved the earlier issues. There would be disruption from the construction, though it would not be substantial enough to refuse the application and the hours could be limited. The Strategic Director, Regeneration indicated that the proposed dwelling would sit comfortably within the cul-de-sac and would be similar, though slightly larger, to the other properties on the street. The open space was not protected and the loss of a view was not a planning issue. In respect of the comment from the Council's Trees Team, it was acknowledged that the proposal may put pressure on the felling of the trees, however, the woodland was protected and there would be some overshadowing. It was noted that the impact on the trees did not warrant the refusal of the application. With regards to parking and access, it was reported that the existing access would be retained and a provision of two parking spaces per dwelling was adequate. The Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that the application would not pose a detrimental impact on the area and recommended it for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to Members' queries, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that if the application was approved then the conservatory on the side of the farm would be removed and that both the existing and proposed dwelling would have a garage and parking space.

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

- That the previous application had been rejected due to the scale, siting and residential amenity and that it was contrary to policies.
- That various extensions had been approved to the host property since.
- That overdevelopment was an issue.

- That the new proposal was a marginally smaller dwelling than the previous application.
- That the new proposal contravened policies D1 and UR3.
- That the application should be rejected.

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

- That the new application should be looked at in conjunction with the applications that had been approved in February 2009.
- That the simultaneous applications for the farm house and new dwelling had been declined as an overdevelopment of the site.
- That amendments to the farm house had been approved.
- That the application was overdevelopment and this had been overlooked by the planning officer.
- That the application contravened policies D1 and UR3.
- That the proposal would create over dominance of No.12 Rosedale Close.
- That the rear garden of No.12 would be overshadowed by the proposed new dwelling.
- That the Council's Trees officer had agreed that the proposal would be detrimental to No.12.
- That the proposal would remove the open street scene and contradict policy D5.
- That the planning officer had given tacit approval prior to consultations being undertaken.
- That the application should be rejected.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that the proposed property was slightly smaller than the previous application and did not impinge on the 45 degree angle in relation to overlooking. The plans submitted reflected the extensions to the farm and it was acknowledged that there would be some overshadowing of No. 12 Rosedale Close.

Another objector raised the following issues:

- That the proposal was out of character and an overdevelopment.
- That applications for extensions and a new dwelling had previously been refused.
- That extensions to the farm house had been approved in February 2009.
- That work had not started on the extension.
- That planning officers had a copy of an independent report that had been commissioned in October 2007.

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

- That the officer's report was clear, concise and objective.
- That an application had been refused on 12 September 2007.
- That the planning officer through discussions and correspondence had suggested that a smaller dwelling and garage be built.
- That the new application proposed a smaller dwelling.
- That the proposed dwelling was sited further away from boundaries.
- That the Parish Council had not objected to the application.
- That the Highways Department had not objected.
- That the levels were raised as a barn had been on the site in the past.
- That the ground level of the site would be dropped and the proposed dwelling would nearly be on the same level as No.12 Rosedale Close.
- That the new dwelling's levels and scale had been reduced.

- That there would be a single garage.
- That the objections were acknowledged.
- That the officer's report should be accepted.

During the discussion a Member raised a concern in respect of the alleged removal of the farm's conservatory and it was requested that a condition requesting its removal be placed on the application.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report and subject to the following additional condition:

- (i) **That the existing conservatory at Bank Top Farm be removed prior to the commencement of any development.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

- (b) **Land adjacent to Cleasby Court, Kirklands Close, Menston, Ilkley Wharfedale**

Full application for the construction of a two storey detached dwelling on land at Cleasby Court, Kirklands Close, Menston - 09/05594/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. It was explained that the proposal was to construct a 2 storey detached dwelling on land at Cleasby Court, Kirklands Close, Menston, which had not been allocated within the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. The Parish Council had requested that the application be refused and be determined by the Panel. Amended plans had been circulated to the Parish Council, however, they had not commented upon them prior to the publication of the officer's report. It was noted that four representations had been received from local residents and one from the Menston Community Association. The Council's Drainage and Highways Departments had been consulted on the scheme and had not submitted any objections. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the site was within a built up area of Menston and was a reasonable size plot. With regard to the residential amenity, it was reported that the proposal would be a modest size dwelling constructed on a similar size plot, scale and massing to the other houses in the vicinity. The distance between the adjoining dwelling to the rear was 21 metres and the rear first floor windows would be obscured glazed. The mature hedge would also provide screening. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the application had been amended twice in order to resolve the objections submitted. The proposed construction materials were stone and slate and the amended plans had omitted the originally proposed Juliet balconies. There would not be an impact on the block of flats to the rear as the distance between the two buildings would be 18 metres. The dwelling would be visible from Main Street, however, it was not considered that this would have a detrimental impact on the street scene. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that there were no highways or community safety issues and stated that the proposed dwelling would not have an adverse impact on the adjacent properties or the environment. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to a Member's query regarding the materials to be used, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that a condition could be placed on the application which specified that samples had to be submitted and approved prior to any development taking place.

An objector was present at the meeting and outlined the following concerns:

- That the Parish Council had not received the amended plans.
- That three of the four flats in Garth House belonged to the applicant.
- That the proposed dwelling would be built on amenity space intended for the flats.
- That the plot of land was smaller than shown on the plans.
- That a large amount of the area was taken up by the access to the flat's garages.
- That the proposed dwelling was a large house for a small plot.
- That the outlook of the ground floor flat of Garth House would be spoilt.
- That the distance from the ground floor flat of Garth House to the garages was 12 metres.
- That the distance from Garth House to the house at the rear was not acceptable.
- That the obscured glazing could be changed.
- That the application was not dissimilar to the previous one.

In response to Members' concerns, the Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that the obscured glazing was a condition of the application as it would create overlooking if it were to be removed. It was confirmed that the development would be constructed within the red line detailed on the map, which was accurate. The right to cross the driveway within the development site was different to its ownership and the application would not be able to be implemented if other people had a right of way over the driveway. However, there was no evidence to suggest that the information submitted was incorrect.

Resolved –

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

- (i) **That samples of the materials to be used be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any development; and**
- (ii) **That the large tree to the south of the site be retained.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

- (c) **Manywells Industrial Estate, Manywells Brow, Cullingworth, Bingley Rural Bingley**

Outline application with means of access to be considered for construction of mixed use development at Manywells Industrial Estate, Manywells Brow, Cullingworth, Bingley – 09/04432/OUT.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration began by tabling additional documentation which consisted of a letter from the Parish Council that objected to the amendment of the Section 106 Agreement; a letter from the applicant's legal representative which suggested an amended form of words for the current Condition 8; and a letter from the applicant which indicated that a condition was a more appropriate way of progressing the development scheme and proposed an alternative Section 106 Agreement. It was also noted that the two proposed options should include the provision of pedestrian crossing on Cullingworth Road.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that in December 2009 a mixed use scheme had been approved on the site, subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement. The applicants had subsequently stated that they could not sign the Agreement with the suggested wording. Members were then informed of two alternatives; Option A, which contained the original Section 106 Agreement; and Option B which was subject to a Section 106 Agreement and a condition that no more than 30 dwellings on the site should be occupied until 7000 square metres of employment space had been completed.

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

- That the development was to provide 288 jobs and evidence of this estimation was required.
- That the applicant seemed to be unwilling or have an inability to deliver what had been stated.
- That a condition placed on the application could be appealed.
- That a Section 106 Agreement would have more impact.
- That it was suspected that the scheme would not be developed as proposed.
- That Cullingworth was a small village with poor transport links.
- That there was a good example of a similar scheme in Denholme, which had been amended.
- Was the development to satisfy housing targets or would integrity be used?

An objector was present at the meeting and outlined the following concerns:

- That since December 2009, Natural England had submitted a report that the orchid site should be retained and this should be ensured within the application.
- That only 30 dwellings should be built and the Care Home should be built at the other side of the wildlife area.

In response the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that there was no intention to alter Condition 28, which related to the orchid survey, within the report.

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

- That it was agreed that the site should be a mixed use development.
- That there was an opportunity to develop the site.
- That the Parish Council's comments regarding residential and employment use had been previously decided by the Panel.
- That the applicant was not challenging the decision, but wanted to raise concerns regarding the process.
- That a Section 106 Agreement would be an imposition of the permission compared to a condition.
- That the marketing strategy demonstrated a willingness to deliver the scheme.
- That the mechanisms involved were the key factors of the proposal.
- That a condition on the application was more favourable than a Section 106 Agreement.
- That conditions could be enforced via a Breach of Conditions Notice.
- That the use of a condition was more robust for both parties.
- That they were concerned with the Parish Council's comments regarding the "willingness to deliver" the scheme.
- That the site could be left derelict, but as much of the scheme as possible would be progressed within the timescales set.
- That a condition would still allow the Council to review the decision made.
- That a robust mechanism and marketing strategy were required.

- That a condition should be placed on the permission.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and stated the following:

- That he was concerned that the Section 106 Agreement would be removed from the permission.
- That he had been informed by a number of the companies that had left the Industrial Estate recently that they had done so due to the condition of the site, the increase in rents and the conditions on the insurance.
- That the companies which had left the site were still trading, so a marketing strategy should have been focused on those companies that had left the site and those that were still there.
- That there should be a separate entrance to the Industrial Estate and the rest of the site sold.
- That if the condition was breached what could the Council do?
- That the original Section 106 Agreement was vital and should be retained.

In response to a comment made, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that there were legal ways to progress a breach of condition, however, a breach of condition notice could be appealed against.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration then gave the following responses to Members' questions:

- That the Council's Section 106 Agreement echoed the requirements of the planning conditions, whereas the applicant's suggested Agreement was more flexible. It still contained a similar clause in relation to the occupation of 30 dwellings, but with riders that aided the developer to progress the scheme and included a clause that the housing aspect of the development could be progressed based upon the proof that a serious and robust marketing strategy had been undertaken but no opportunities had arisen.
- That a draft marketing strategy had been submitted and was being considered.
- That the applicant could request a variation to the Section 106 agreement. The first 5 years were at the discretion of the Council and after 5 years the applicant had a statutory right to vary the Agreement and could appeal.
- That the marketing exercise was not part of the Section 106 Agreement and if it was not successful then the applicant could apply to the Council with an alternative proposal.
- That any future applications for the site could be submitted to the Panel for consideration.

At this point in the proceedings it was,

Resolved -

That the public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the item relating to Manywells Industrial Estate, Manywells Brow, Cullingworth, Bingley on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if they were present exempt information within Paragraph 5 (legal privilege) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) would be disclosed and it is considered that, in all the circumstances, the public interest in allowing the public to remain is outweighed by the public interest in excluding public access to the relevant part of the proceedings for the following reason:

It is in the overriding interests of proper administration that Members are made fully aware of the legal implications of any decision without the risk of prejudice to the Council's case in any future legal proceedings that may be initiated.

On resumption of the public meeting the Chair reported that the Panel had been advised to bestow little weight to the comment regarding the rent increase at the Industrial Estate as it was hearsay. He explained that the outcome of the meeting in December 2009 had resulted in a Section 106 Agreement and a condition that covered the same issues and this issue needed to be resolved.

During the discussion Members agreed that the original Condition 8 could be removed, however, the initial Section 106 Agreement should be retained as it provided integrity and a robust mechanism. In order to enable the project to be delivered it was requested that no more than 30 houses be occupied until at least 7,000 square metres of the employment floor space had been completed. The inclusion of the pedestrian crossing and a vehicle activated speed sign was also approved. In conclusion Members stated that any variation, amendment or new application on the site should be submitted to the Panel for consideration.

Resolved –

- (1) That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director, Regeneration to grant planning permission subject to the conditions previously approved by the Panel on 16 December 2009, save for Condition 8 which shall be deleted; and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to provide the following:**
 - (i) Payment of an off site recreation contribution to be used primarily in Cullingworth (£30,000);**
 - (ii) Provision of full details of arrangements for the provision of affordable housing on the site;**
 - (iii) Payment of a contribution to increase educational facilities primarily in Cullingworth (£189,187);**
 - (iv) Provision of two bus shelters (including raised kerbs) on Manywells Brow;**
 - (v) No more than 30 dwellings on the site shall be occupied until at least 7,000 square metres of the employment floor space has been completed and is ready for occupation; and**
 - (vi) A pedestrian crossing be provided on Cullingworth Road, near to Sutton Drive along with a vehicle activated speed sign.**
- (2) That should the Section 106 Agreement not be signed within 3 months of the date of the Panel's decision, that authority be delegated to the Strategic Director, Regeneration to refuse to grant planning permission on the grounds that the applicants have failed to demonstrate that the essential requirements of the planning permission can be delivered.**
- (3) That it be made clear within the 'reasons for decision' section of the Decision Notice that the purpose of allowing the provision of the housing on the development is to enable the delivery of the employment floor space.**
- (4) That any new application submitted in respect of the site be presented to the Panel for consideration.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(d) Transco Compound, View Croft Road, Shipley**Shipley**

A full planning application for the extension of an existing 15m tower by 10m, the installation of three 4-stack dipolar antennas, one 0.3m dish antenna and one equipment cabin and feeder gantry for the Airwave Emergency Services Network at the Transco Compound, View Croft Road, Shipley - 10/00451/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the application was for an extension to the existing mast and confirmed that the applicant had submitted supporting information that proved the need for the installation, which would allow wider coverage for the emergency services. It was noted that the Council's Conservation Team had responded following the publication of the report and had indicated that the application would impact on the Leeds and Liverpool Canal Conservation Area and on the Saltaire World Heritage Site. The Strategic Director, Regeneration indicated that the mast would be difficult to see from Saltaire and therefore would not impact in the Heritage Site. It was not believed to cause harm to the Canal Conservation Area either. It was confirmed that there were mixed use and residential areas in the vicinity, however, they were not near enough to the site to cause any significant harm to residential amenity. The Strategic Director, Regeneration recommended that Members be minded to approve the application following the expiry of the statutory period of publicity.

In response to a Member's queries, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that alternative sites had been investigated, however, they had been refused for reasons such as prominence and being too close to residential properties.

A representative of an emergency service was at the meeting and stated the following points:

- That if the current site was lost then this would significantly affect the safety of officers and the service would not be able to provide its duty to the residents of Shipley.
- That the current location needed to be increased.
- That the existing mast height needed to be raised above 25 metres in order to facilitate new capacity.

Resolved –

That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director, Regeneration to grant planning permission on the expiry of the statutory period of publicity.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(e) 30 Main Street, Burley in Wharfedale, Ilkley**Wharfedale**

Planning application for the construction of a double garage at 30 Main Street, Burley in Wharfedale - 09/05367/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and explained that there were listed residential properties in the vicinity. The current wall was to form part of the boundary to the proposed garage building. It was noted that there had been three applications for detached dwellings on the site which had been refused. The Parish Council had recommended that the application be approved and two letters of objection had been received. The Council's Design and Conservation Team had indicated

that the proposal compromised the historic character of the conservation area. The Strategic Director, Regeneration then recommended that the application be refused on the basis of its impact on the conservation area, the historic buildings and the open aspect of the area.

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

- That the application was tenable.
- That the Parish Council had looked at the application objectively.
- That the proposed garage would not be seen from the village green.
- That the Parish Council had no objections to the area being tidied up and a modest building erected.
- That the existing hard standing would be incorporated into the proposed garage.
- That the only noticeable change would be the proposed timber doors of the building.
- That the objections regarding the increase in traffic were untenable.
- That the proposed garage would not be noticeable.
- That the building would be carefully constructed.
- That the comments from the Planning Inspector were based upon a proposal for a dwelling at the site.
- That the application should be approved.

The applicant was also present at the meeting and outlined the following issues:

- That a full wall to the west of the site would also be incorporated into the construction of the garage, which meant that two full walls and one part wall would be used in total.
- That the height of the garage would be no more than 2.3 metres at any point, which was the height of the existing walls.
- That the base of the garage would be smaller than the current hard standing.
- That the Planning Inspector's comments that the single storey building would be intrusive referred to the construction of a dwelling on the site.
- That the proposal was for a garage not a house.
- That the proposal would cover 7% of the site.
- That a condition to remove further development rights would be acceptable.
- That the garage was required for security reasons.
- That he believed the application would have been approved if the previous proposals had not been submitted.
- That there was no public access to the site.

In response to Members' queries the Strategic Director, Regeneration and the applicant confirmed that:

- The garage would have a flat roof.
- The doors would be hard wood and reclaimed stone would be used to match the existing walls.
- The shed would be removed if the garage was approved.

Resolved –

That the application be granted as set out below:

That the proposal would maintain and enhance the Burley in Wharfedale Conservation Area and would preserve the setting of the Listed Buildings fronting Main Street. As such the proposal would be in accordance to policies BH4A, BH7, BH10 and OS8 of Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

And that the application be subject to the following conditions:

- (i) That the construction of the garage to commence within 3 years; and**
- (ii) That samples of all the materials, including doors, be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any development.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(f) The Stone Yard, Derry Hill, Menston, Ilkley Wharfedale

Full application for the erection of a sales office, stores and associated hard standing and parking areas at Clayax Yorkstone Ltd, The Stone Yard, Derry Hill, Menston - 09/05910/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that the application had been submitted during 2009 with the plans being put forward in February 2010. The officer's report referred to these plans, however, amended plans had been submitted following the publication of the report. It was agreed that the application should be deferred in order to allow the consideration of the amended plans.

Resolved –

That the application be deferred to allow the amended plans submitted to be considered.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(g) Enforcement Enquiries Closed by the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees)/Senior Enforcement Officer as Not Expedient to Pursue

(i) 14 Ferncliffe Drive, Baildon Baildon

Unauthorised fence - 09/00794/ENFUNA

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 23 September 2009

(ii) 18 Fennec Road, Baildon Baildon

Horse Chestnut and Sycamore in rear garden pruned by neighbours without council authority - 09/00627/TPOCN

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 25 January 2010

(iii) **3 Lees Moor Meadows, Cullingworth, Bingley**

Bingley Rural

Tree damage - 09/00684/TPOCN

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 4 February 2010

(iv) **39 Woodvale Crescent, Bingley**

Bingley

Unauthorised tree works - 09/00655/TPOCN

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 25 January 2010

(v) **5 - 7 Providence Row, Baildon**

Baildon

Unauthorised tree works - 09/00646/TPOCN

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 25 January 2010

(vi) **88 Main Street, Bingley**

Bingley

Unauthorised change of use - 09/01136/ENFCOU

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 25 January 2010

(vii) **Brooklands, Haworth Road, Cullingworth, Bingley**

Bingley Rural

Unauthorised business & building works and unauthorised fencing - 08/00614/ENFCOU

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 4 February 2010

(viii) **Ling Bob Mill, Main Street, Wilsden, Bingley**

Bingley Rural

Breach of a planning condition - 09/00796/ENFCON

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 9 February 2010

(ix) **Royston Fold Farm, Saltaire Road, Eldwick, Bingley** **Bingley**

Unauthorised tree works - 09/00729/TPOCN

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 18 January 2010

(x) **The Glen Tea Rooms, Prod Lane, Baildon** **Baildon**

Unauthorised alterations to roof - 09/01530/ENFUNA

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 15 February 2010

(xi) **Unit 1 Peel House, 2 Taunton Street, Shipley** **Shipley**

Unauthorised tree works - 09/00697/TPOCN

It was not considered that this breach of planning control would cause significant amenity or highway safety issues to warrant further enforcement action.

Date Enforcement File Closed: 29 January 2010

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(f) **Decisions Made by the Secretary Of State**

APPEALS DISMISSED

(i) **Alif's Self Service, 120 Crag Road, Shipley** **Windhill and Wrose**

Construction of detached dwelling - Case No: 09/00144/FUL

Appeal Ref: 09/00107/APPFUL

(ii) **Clayax Yorkstone Limited, Derry Hill, Menston, Ilkley** **Wharfedale**

Replacement sales office and stores - Case No: 09/02483/FUL

Appeal Ref: 09/00148/APPFUL

APPEAL WITHDRAWN

(iii) **Charlestown Baptist Church, Oxford Place, Baildon**

Baildon

Change of use from former Baptist Church to office use with demolition of flat roof extension and general refurbishment - Case No: 09/04305/FUL

Appeal Ref: 09/00204/APPFUL

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

Action: *Strategic Director, Regeneration*

Chair

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

i:\minutes\pls10Mar

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