

# Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley & Shipley) held on Wednesday 9 December 2015 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

---

Commenced 1000  
Adjourned 1050  
Re-convened 1055  
Adjourned 1124  
Re-convened 1129  
Adjourned 1208  
Re-convened 1213  
Concluded 1258

**PRESENT – Councillors**

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	INDEPENDENTS
Miller	Shabir Hussain (Chair)	Naylor
M Pollard	Bacon	
	Farley	
	Lee	

Observers: Councillor K Hussain (Minutes 33, 35 and 36)

**Councillor Shabir Hussain in the Chair**

**29. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

The following disclosures of interest were received in the interests of clarity:

Councillor Miller knew both of the applicants in respect of minutes 37 and 38.

**30. MINUTES**

**Resolved -**

**That the minutes of the meetings held on 11 March, 8 April, 29 April, 29 June, 22 July, 2 September and 7 October 2015 be signed as a correct record.**

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

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

**32. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no questions submitted by the public.



Full planning application for change of use from a training centre to create 7 no. one bed flats and a single retail unit at 20 Russell Street, Keighley – 15/03167/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that the Parish Council recommended approval subject to bin storage considerations. There have been 9 representations in favour of the proposal and 10 representations objecting to the proposal.

The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "I".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture reported that the principle of the change of use to flats and a small shop was considered acceptable. The details had been assessed as being acceptable in terms of their impact on neighbouring occupants, visual amenity, and setting of Keighley Town Centre Conservation Area, residential amenity, parking, highway safety and community safety. As such the proposal was considered to accord with Policies E3, UDP1, UR2, CR3A, BH7, D1, H7, H8, UR3, TM12, TM19A and D4 of the RUDP and would form sustainable development compatible with the NPPF. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

Members made the following comments:

- At the top of Russell Street there was access to unload lorries.
- The double yellow lines would have to stay.
- Could there be a loading / unloading Sign?
- Would there be a communal bin or several individual bins?
- Has work already started and was this a retrospective application?
- Could you get the bin storage inside the building?
- Whose bin was it at the moment, was it business people? There could be an argument between residents and business people.
- There could be four bins for each flat.
- Concern was expressed that there could be a lot of rubbish.
- What was the small area adjacent to the unit?
- On page 10 of the report it refers to the plan, can I see the plan?
- I support this application. One bedroom flats are needed in Keighley.
- It should be a communal bin as individual bins would not work.
- The diagram only shows one bin.
- There was not enough bin storage and it was better to lose one flat in order to deal with this problem.
- Rubbish could be left on the street.
- Not in favour of putting bins inside; they should stay outside. There should be a trade bin. The bin pick up was every two weeks.
- There were a lot of objections from business as they feel they have more right to use the yard than residents of the proposed development.
- Can you clarify how much of the yard was owned by the applicant?
- There would be large recycling and communal bins.
- It was not practical to park in the yard.
- Any conditions have to be practical.
- The question was who owned the gates?
- Who owned the gates was not a planning matter.

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

- I support the officer recommendation for approval.



- There has been some concern about litter. I have spoken to the applicant and he would put in a communal bin outside rather than inside due to the smell.
- The applicant would comply with all the conditions outlined in page 10 of the report.

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

- We could ask for a restriction in respect of loading and unloading of goods.
- There was a communal entrance.
- Some work has already been done inside.
- There was trade waste and waste for flats.
- A condition could be put for it to be communal bins.
- We would ask about the bins and might need to take some of the retail unit to accommodate the bins.
- The small area adjacent to the unit was for electrics.
- The applicant owns up to half of the yard.
- Larger bins would be outside.
- There was a dispute as to who owned the gates.

#### **Resolved –**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report with condition three amended as follows:**

**Facilities for the secure storage of communal general waste and recycling bins for the flats, and a trade waste bin for the retail shop shall be provided within the site before any part of the development is brought into use. Details of the size of these waste bin storage facilities and the position, size and means of enclosure to these waste bin storage facilities shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any of the development is occupied. Thereafter these facilities shall remain available for use as long as the development is in use for the purposes hereby permitted.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

#### **34. HOULDSWORTH OF YORKSHIRE, CULLINGWORTH MILLS, GREENSIDE LANE, CULLINGWORTH, BINGLEY**

**Bingley Rural**

Construction of new stone saw enclosure and boundary fencing at Houldsworth of Yorkshire Stone Yard, Cullingworth Mills, Greenside Lane, Cullingworth – 15/06203/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that six representations objecting to the application have been made by residents of Hallowes Park Road and the adjacent property on Greenside Lane. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "I".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the existing use of the site was considered to be lawful in planning terms and the proposal would not materially change this lawful established use or exacerbate any of the environmental impacts associated with the use. Furthermore it was considered that the enclosure of a substantial part of the eastern area of the site under an appropriately insulated building should help to mitigate the impact of noise and dust generated by stone sawing operations upon adjacent residents. Subject to conditions reserving approval of



details it was also considered that the proposed new building would be acceptable in design terms. The proposal was considered to accord with saved policies UDP4 (Economic Regeneration), E4 (Protecting Existing Employment Land and Buildings in Rural Areas), UR3 (The Local Impact of Development), D1 (General Design Considerations), P1 (Air Quality) and P7 (Noise) of the replacement Unitary Development Plan and the national planning policy principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

Members made the following comments:

- Were there any other noise making machines?
- What were the current hours of operation?
- Where would the dressing of stones be done?
- You don't need a new shed. Approval with operating hours would be a planning condition.
- It was a noisy place.

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

- There were not any other noise making machines.
- It was concluded that it was not possible to take enforcement action on the hours of operation.
- The dressing of stones would be done inside the sheds.
- Any planning condition on hours of operation would be appealed and won. It could not be enforced and was not relevant.

**Resolved –**

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

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

35. **1374 THORNTON ROAD, DENHOLME, BRADFORD**

**Bingley Rural**

Retrospective householder application for the retention of wall cladding to south-west elevation of 1374 Thornton Road, Denholme Bradford – 15/03205/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Denholme Town Council had objected to the application. Although it applauds the applicant's desire to weatherproof the building, there seems to be no evidence of consideration of other methods. The Council feels the cladding was incongruous with domestic buildings in the area. Three letters of support had been received. Two Ward Councillors had also e-mailed in support and had requested referral of the application to Panel in the event that officers recommended refusal. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "I".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the external cladding of part of this dwelling with sheet steel was not an acceptable form of development, since it resulted in significant visual harm by substantially changing the character of the building. The use of sheet steel cladding on the exterior of dwellings was not in any way a locally distinctive form of development and this use of inappropriate external materials was fundamentally contrary to Policies UDP3, UR3 and D1 of the RUDP, all of which seek a satisfactory quality of development and the protection of visual amenity. He therefore recommended refusal of the application.



This application was deferred from the meeting of the Committee on 7 October, 2015 to enable the applicant to circulate a report as the report did not refer to examination of materials we are no further forward. The officer recommendation stays the same as at 7 October. The applicant wants to have a new scheme which would mean a new planning application. Officers can't support the retention of cladding.

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

- This application was deferred for a report and the report has been presented.
- Page one of the report highlights the damp problem.
- There has been some movement on this issue.

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

- Other people who had owned the building wished to demolish it.
- There was a galvanised frame above the existing cladding which was like insulation.
- As landlord I have to ensure that my property was mould and damp free.
- We have to cope with high winds and rain.
- I have spent thousands of pounds on cladding.
- Can you approve it as it is?
- There was a lot of mould.
- The cladding was a last solution.
- I've tried my best to do what I can.
- A child lives in the house and I need to deal with the outlined problems.
- I have spoken to building control and asked what can I do? They said they don't know.
- Only the top half of the building has been cladded.
- I have consulted a specialist.

Members made the following comments:

- The applicant's report was not signed and was not suitable.
- I would be glad if it was cedar wood cladding but this has been proposed at the last minute.
- When it was a pub it had a rendered wall.
- The applicant's report was meant to identify alternatives.
- There was a problem of movement not just permeability of stonework.
- Was an alternative solution possible?
- The applicant has tried his best.
- You could refuse this application and work out another option with no further enforcement action taken against the applicant.

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

- The applicant has done a Rolls Royce job but not in planning terms.
- When it was a pub it had a random course stone rubber filled wall.
- The applicant could withdraw his application and submit another application with no enforcement action taken for a period of 3 months.
- We would deal with any new application as quick as possible.

**Resolved –**

**That subject to receiving written confirmation, this application is to be regarded as withdrawn. To allow submission of a new application proposing an alternative form of**



**rendered cladding to the gable, the Council's Planning Enforcement Team shall be instructed not to pursue formal enforcement action for a period of 3 months.**

36. **LAND AT HALIFAX ROAD, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley East**

Full planning application for the construction of 5 residential dwellings and new access road and parking on land at Halifax Road, Keighley – 15/03334/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Keighley Town Council recommended approval. 9 representations in support and 7 representations objecting to the proposal had been received. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "I".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed development was unacceptable due to the proposed means of access being from Halifax Road which was a busy classified highway (A629). It was considered that right turning movements into and out of the site are likely to lead to conditions prejudicial to highway safety contrary to Policy TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

The proposal failed to provide workable off road parking for all the development. In particular the parking provision for Plots 1, 2 and 5 was either too remote to ensure that the parking provision would be used, or the driveway lengths are too short. As a result, on street parking would cause congestion near the access or blocking the turning head to the detriment of highway safety contrary to Policy TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

The layout of the terrace, the ridge and eave heights and fenestration of the proposed development failed to adequately reflect the stepped uniform terrace development in the area and would form an incongruous feature detracting from the strong uniform character of terraced residential development in this area. It was considered that the proposed form and appearance of the development represented poor design that would detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and not form sustainable development compatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. He therefore recommended refusal of the application.

Members made the following comments:

- Planning permission was granted for houses.
- Skipton Properties were going to develop 12 houses and now we are told the application should be refused due to access.
- In respect of design there were a number of different houses in the area. It was a mess at the moment.
- I don't understand highways objections to five houses.
- The traffic lights caused more problems when they were installed.
- It was a big site and you could ask for more houses.
- It was Council policy to have 10 or 12 houses.
- There should be conditions in respect of fencing
- I did a site visit yesterday and some of the report doesn't make sense to me.
- There were other modern randomly designed properties below.
- This area has been an eyesore.
- There would be a problem to turn right but people would know this.
- A lot of places don't have parking outside.
- The properties down the street are not uniform.
- People know that Halifax Road was busy.



- An application for a 100 plus homes near Keighley's busiest roads was refused and then approved by the Planning Inspector as they said our highways issues were not valid.
- This application would win an appeal.
- Planning permission should be granted.

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

- The road was unadopted.
- Bradford highways use Leeds Council guide and don't use their own gradients.
- Right hand turning happens everywhere.
- The traffic lights slow down the traffic.
- This was a tiny development.
- Planning officers misunderstood the parking situation as 3 units have 2 off street parking spaces.
- In respect of design the mass was kept down as we didn't want it to be overbearing.
- The development would be an attractive picturesque element on the end of the road.
- I am happy to accept any condition in respect of mature shrubs.

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

- It was said it was a busy road. Which road was not busy? It was all based on assumptions.
- It was discussed at Full Council that 42,000 houses were needed and these are 5 houses that we need.
- There was a dire housing need in Keighley.
- Please approve this application.

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

- I'm sorry I did not bring up the history of the site in the report and during the officer presentation.
- The main entrance was into Grove Mills and was seen to take primary access.
- There was access off Halifax Road.

**Resolved –**

**That planning permission be granted for the following reasons and subject to the following planning conditions:**

**Reason for Granting :**

**There are no concerns regarding the safety of the proposed means of access from Halifax Road or the parking, and the design is acceptable given the character of the surrounding area.**

- (1) Before any part of the development is brought into use, the proposed means of vehicular and pedestrian access hereby approved shall be laid out, hard surfaced, sealed and drained within the site in accordance with the approved plan and completed to a constructional specification approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**
- (2) Before the development is brought into use, the off street car parking facility shall be laid out, hard surfaced, sealed and drained within the curtilage of the site in accordance with the approved drawings. The gradient shall be no**



**steeper than 1 in 15 except where otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

- (3) The western boundary of the site shall remain closed and no access for vehicles shall be formed to Knowle Close other than with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.**
- (4) Lighting to safeguard the safety of users of the proposed car parking area shall be provided and made available for use prior to the occupation of the dwellings. Details of the position, type, direction and spread of illumination and intensity of such lighting shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to its installation.**
- (5) Before the car parking area is brought into use, a scheme of landscaping and screening shall be implemented between the parking spaces and the dwellings to the west. Notwithstanding details shown on the approved drawings, details of this screening and planting shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the car parking area is created.**
- (6) Prior to the commencement of work on the walls of the dwellings, arrangements shall be made with the Local Planning Authority for the inspection of samples of the external walling and roofing materials for the dwellings. These shall be approved in writing prior to the commencement of work on the walls of the dwellings, and the development shall be built in the materials so approved.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

### **37. SIDE GARDEN IN CHURCH FARM, MAIN STREET, STANBURY, KEIGHLEY**

#### **Worth Valley**

Full application for the construction of a 3-bedroom subterranean dwelling with associated car parking and landscaped garden at Side Garden of Church Farm, Main Street, Stanbury, Keighley – 15/04267/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that the Parish Council had no objections provided the development was completed in a timely manner. Eight letters of support had been received. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “I”.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed development would involve inappropriate development in the Green belt as it would be outside the settlement limit of Stanbury defined on the RUDP Proposals Map and would not fill a small gap in a small group of buildings. The development would not accord with criteria set out in Policy GB3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. The expansion of the settlement would be to the detriment of the openness and would conflict with the purposes of including the land in the Green Belt. As such the proposals are contrary to Policy GB1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed development would result in the expansion of urbanising form into the valued rural landscape setting of the village. This would unacceptably harm local visual amenity and the character and quality of the landscape setting of the village, contrary to Policies UDP3, UR3, NE3





and NE3A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The application site was open in character and provided a key vista to the south through the Stanbury Conservation Area. The proposed development of the site would compromise this key view or vista. The development would also result in a substantial and incongruous garden space with its associated domestic accoutrements, car parking and driveway/turning area extending south from the identified settlement boundary to the detriment of the character of the Stanbury Conservation Area, contrary to Policies UDP3 and BH7 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. He therefore recommended refusal of the application.

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

- This was our existing house.
- There was access to Church Farm.
- This has been our garden since 1991.
- In respect of design visual impact was as minimal as possible.
- You would not see the proposed building from the main road.
- There was dry stone walling.
- The roof was brassed in.
- The development would be self sustainable.
- The house would have a positive impact.
- The house would be built to the highest insulated standards.
- He needed a ground floor premises only and would sell Church Farm.

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

- This was a case of principle.
- There were no highways or drainage issues.
- The Parish Council supports the application.
- Eight people in the village have written to support the application.
- There were no objections to the application.
- Stanbury was an appropriate village for infilling.
- The development would not impede open views as it was a subterranean dwelling.
- An above ground house would cause more harm.
- The barn was converted in 1990.
- We are not in dispute that it was a garden.
- The new fence was shown on the 2013 plan.
- We would be flexible on the boundary.

Members made the following comments:

- Was the development proposed to enable the applicant to stay in the village?
- I love the Green Belt but people still get planning permission to put wind turbines in the Green Belt.
- I understand about setting a precedent but I am minded to grant approval.
- The reason for the infill site was that it follows an ancient boundary.
- The application would set a precedent. I can't support it.
- Policy was for guidance.
- It was a great innovative design.
- I do know Stanbury but I don't like the solar panel idea, would it would stand out like a sore thumb.



- I am concerned about the elevation. It was a very clever design.
- I regard the Green Belt as sacrosanct but it was an unusual and sufficiently different design. I am minded to accept this one.
- Policy was a rule not a guideline.
- The design should be welcomed but I am struggling with the precedent.

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

- Infill was permissible.
- I can't support development in the Green Belt outside an infilling area.
- The national planning policy framework was quite general.
- We have defined what the Council means by infilling.

The Council's legal representative confirmed that policy was a rule and not a guideline and you could depart from it for good reasons. It could lead to other infill requests.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be referred for determination by the Regulatory and Appeals Committee with the recommendation of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) that, although it recognises the position of the development in the Green Belt, it was minded to grant planning permission due to the innovative nature of this particular design and development, which will minimise the impact on the openness of the Green Belt.**

**Conditions were suggested regarding the need for hedge planting to the south boundary and measures to reduce the visual impact of the car parking.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

**38. MILL HOUSE, 44 IVY BANK LANE, HAWORTH, KEIGHLEY Bingley Rural**

Tree Preservation Order application to fell one Horse Chestnut tree on land at 44 Ivy Bank Lane, Haworth -15/04597/TPO.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that there was no statutory requirement to seek Parish Council views in respect of TPO work and that no publicity and representations were required under the TPO legislation

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that removal of the Horse Chestnut would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the Conservation Area and to public visual amenity. However there are numerous structural and health issues with the tree and its removal and replacement with two replacement Lime trees was considered to be justified. He therefore recommended that consent be granted.

A Member stated that experts had agreed the tree should be felled.

**Resolved –**

**That consent be granted for the removal of the T1 horse chestnut tree and it be conditioned that it be replaced by 2 lime trees.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***



### 39. REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(i) **129 Bradford Road, Shipley** **Shipley**

Breach of condition 3 of planning permission 09/02153/COU – 12/00395/ENFCON.

On 27 August 2015 The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised enforcement action requiring the occupier/owner of the premises to comply with the requirements of the condition.

(ii) **15 Bradford Street, Keighley** **Keighley Central**

Construction of a rear extension of timber and plastic construction with timber panels and timber fencing– 15/00071/ENFUNA

The unauthorised development was considered to be detrimental to visual amenity. The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 11 November 2015.

(iii) **90 Bradford Road, Menston** **Wharfedale**

Change of use from residential to mixed use of residential and the non-residential storage and sale of motor vehicles – 15/00214/ENFCOU.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 1 October 2015.

**Resolved –**

**That the report be noted.**

**NO ACTION**

### 40. DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

#### APPEALS ALLOWED

(i) **10 Market Square, Shipley** **Shipley**

Change of use from retail to amusement centre (to include use of amusements by mean of gambling machines, betting and or bingo) and a tanning/beauty salon - Case No: 15/00207/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 15/00073/APPFL2.

(ii) **19 Burley Road, Menston, Ilkley** **Wharfedale**

Hip to gable alterations with loft conversion and rear extensions - Case No: 14/05344/HOU.

Appeal Ref: 15/00077/APPHOU.

(iii) **32 Grange Road, Riddlesden, Keighley** **Keighley East**

Construction of front dormer window and front porch - Case No: 15/00100/HOU.

Appeal Ref: 15/00086/APPHOU.



(iv) **Jaytail Farm Holden Lane, Silsden** Craven

Installation of one 50kw wind turbine - Case No: 14/03590/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 14/00136/APPFL2.

(v) **Land South Of Stranmour, Occupation Lane, Keighley** Keighley West

Construction of 124 residential dwellings, public open space, landscaping, access, parking and ancillary works - Case No: 14/02541/MAF.

Appeal Ref: 15/00070/APPFL2.

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

Construction of agricultural building for the housing of livestock, with new access and farm track - Case No: 14/05220/FUL

(vii) **Pomona House, Slates Lane, Ilkley** Ilkley

Construction of porch to front elevation - Case No: 15/00820/HOU.

Appeal Ref: 15/00088/APPHOU.

#### **APPEALS DISMISSED**

(viii) **206 Highfield Road, Keighley** Keighley Central

Double storey side and rear extension with rear part split into single storey - Case No: 15/01706/HOU.

Appeal Ref: 15/00104/APPHOU

(ix) **73 Bingley Road, Saltaire, Shipley** Shipley

Repair chimney stack to eastern side of the building - Case No: 14/01791/LBC.

Appeal Ref: 14/00140/APPLB2.

(x) **73 Bingley Road, Shipley** Shipley

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 14/00579/ENFLBC.

Appeal Ref: 15/00025/APPENF.

(xi) **89 Owlet Road, Shipley** Windhill and Wrose

Retrospective application for raised decking to the front of dwelling - Case No: 15/00586/HOU.

Appeal Ref: 15/00087/APPHOU.

(xii) **Bronte Park Nursing Home, Bridgehouse Lane, Haworth, Keighley** Worth Valley

Retrospective application for the installation of 2 flues to outbuilding to support installation of a Biomass wood pellet boiler - Case No: 15/00657/FUL.



Appeal Ref: 15/00078/APPFL2.

(xiii) **Delph Farm, Coates Lane, Silsden**

**Craven**

Construction of rural workers dwelling - Case No: 14/04109/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 15/00064/APPFL2.

(xiv) **Four Bays, Keighley Road, Bingley**

**Bingley**

Construction of one dwelling - Case No: 14/05412/OUT.

Appeal Ref: 15/00079/APPOU2.

(xv) **Land At Grid Ref 415298 446591, Sun Lane, Burley In Wharfedale, Ilkley**

**Wharfedale**

Change of use of Catton Woods from agricultural to use a paintballing leisure facility. Construction of fence. - Case No: 14/03567/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 15/00081/APPFL2.

**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\plks9Dec

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

