

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley & Shipley) held on Wednesday 23 March 2016 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 1000
Adjourned 1134
Re-convened 1143
Adjourned 1250
Re-convened 1255
Concluded 1328

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	THE INDEPENDENTS
Miller	Shabir Hussain (Chair)	Naylor
M Pollard	Abid Hussain (DCh)	
	Bacon	
	Farley	

Observer: Councillor B M Smith (Minute 64)

Councillor Shabir Hussain in the Chair

60. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

- (1) Councillor Abid Hussain was involved in a local business in relation to minute 66.
- (2) Councillor Bacon patronised the establishment mentioned in minute 68.
- (3) Councillor Miller knew the applicant in relation to minute 63.

61. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

62. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.



63. **102 KINGS ROAD, ILKLEY**

Ilkley

Householder application for porch to the front of house at 102 Kings Road, Ilkley – 16/00709/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that there were no objections to the application. There was one comment from Ilkley Civic Society which had no objection to a householder adding a porch to a modern property.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that it was a modest and subordinate addition to the front of this modern detached house, the design and scale balanced with the features of the original dwelling. No adverse effects would be caused to the amenity of any occupiers of neighbouring properties. It accorded with Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and guidance in the Council's Householder SPD. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

A member reported that the application was before members for transparency and recommended approval of 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.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

64. **39 PARKLANDS, ILKLEY**

Ilkley

Full application for the construction of a detached dwelling at 39 Parklands, Ilkley – 15/07493/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 Ilkley Parish Council had recommended refusal of this application on the basis that the proposal represented an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal was also considered to be out of character with surrounding buildings in terms of its appearance and space between dwellings. Objections had been received from 3 households plus Ilkley Civic Society. A Ward Councillor had also objected to the application and made a request that it be considered by members of the Area Planning Panel if recommended for approval. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "O".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed development was considered to relate satisfactorily to the character and appearance of the neighbouring street scene without having a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal sufficiently addressed the reason for refusal on the earlier scheme 15/03989/FUL. As such this proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policies UR3, D1, TM2 and TM19A of the Council's adopted Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2005). He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

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

- I support the objector.
- It was a short cul-de-sac.
- Cars were parked in the drive and along the side of the road. There was no turning head and residents had to ask each other to move their cars.
- The development was not on the right site or the right size.
- Houses which were too small were being built.
- It was not a sustainable development and should be refused.
- The development would have an impact on traffic.

Members made the following comments:

- What metal was being used?
- I like it, the metal cladding looks conspicuous.
- There was enough space to turn the car around.
- I am struggling to see any difference between this application and the one that was refused, except the ridge line.
- It was not a large amendment to the last refusal.

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

- Dark grey metal cladding would be used.
- The required off street parking was being provided.
- Some years ago the house was built on the curtilage of the property. There was a long drive.
- There was a sharp cul-de-sac and a shared footway layout. It was an acceptable width.

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

65. **6 GREENHILL DRIVE, MICKLETHWAITE, BINGLEY**

Bingley

Outline application for single detached dwelling and carport. Land at 6 Greenhill Drive, Micklethwaite, Bingley – 15/04681/OUT.

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 25 letters of objection had been received. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "O". He recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

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

66. CAR PARK, DOVE STREET, KEIGHLEY

Keighley Central

Full planning application (retrospective) for change of use from car park to use as car park and storage yard at Dove Street/Parson Street, Keighley – 15/07200/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 Parish Town Council had recommended refusal due to health and safety and environmental issues. Sixty five representations objecting to the proposal had been received. Thirty eight of the objections were from the local area surrounding the site, eight objectors were from other areas of Keighley including two with family/friends near the site. Ten objectors were from Bradford including five with family/friends near the site, seven objections were from further afield including three with family/friends near the site. Eastwood Primary School was notified of the application but no comments had been received from them. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “O”.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that it was considered that the use of this car park in this mixed residential/industrial area for storage and car parking can be carried out, subject to conditions controlling dust and noise pollution and the provision of off street parking, in a manner that both protects the environment and residential amenities and an existing employment generating use. It was also considered that the development has a satisfactory impact on matters of inclusive access, parking, highway safety and community safety. As such the development would accord with Policies D1, D3, D4, UR3, TM11 and TM19A of the RUDP and forms sustainable development compatible with the NPPF. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

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

- Dust from the site would be reduced.
- It was a mixed use area.
- We have consulted with professionals concerning the dust and noise.
- The noise impact assessment was not significant.
- The yard was used for storage.
- I welcome the planning officer recommendations.
- There was a compromise offer from my client not to use the facilities on a Saturday morning.
- The amount of dust particles entering the atmosphere would be minimised.
- The dust report had indicated no significant impact and the dust would be screened by netting.
- Use of the yard was needed for the viability of the business.
- There was a transport assessment available.
- The limestone was inside the building.
- There were ten parking spaces at the front of the premises.

- The change of use to storage was sustainable.
- The business had operated from the site for over six years and if this business was not supported by the local authority it would not be viable and might have to move outside of the area.
- The application was for change of use of the yard and my client already has permission to take products out onto the highway.
- Lorries would park opposite the highway.
- The existing use was being assessed but there was a need for change of use of the yard. Trucks had to take pallets outside of the building.

Members made the following comments:

- Would tarmac or concrete be used in the gate area?
- What does “Protected characteristics of race mean?”
- I can see a mess at the entrance of the workshop site. I would be upset walking up there.
- You can load on open ground using the public highway.
- Netting is used to contain the dust, what happens when it rips?
- The waste skip was moved indoors.
- How would the two metre net mitigate the dust problem?
- Can we have clarification in respect of the hard surface situation?
- Residents complain about mess on the road. There needs to be hard surface all over the site.
- I welcome trying to alleviate all problems to residents.
- I can see dust and debris on the road. There was no way to stop detritus and debris from coming out onto the road.
- The main problem was the dust and detritus coming out of the door. Further work needs to be done to alleviate this problem.
- The storage area was not the main problem but the area where the fork lift trucks were coming out of.
- We do have a problem with the dust outside, you could put in drainage or have the carwash inside.
- I am not happy with dust gathering outside on a public highway.
- I don't have a dispute with your planning application but I am worried about the dust outside.
- Was the lime bin taken outside?
- Could we look at the previous conditions of approval as the facility was near a school?
- Was this an enforcement issue?
- The applicant should work to a solution of the dust problem as it was good company practice to do something about it.
- We should look at the whole picture of each planning application on its own merit.
- The applicant had done a good job and had operated from the location for six years but the public footpath was very dusty and dirty. The mitigating circumstance was that the dust comes from somewhere and was moved elsewhere.
- You could alleviate the problem of the dust with a puddle patch.
- Yes I want the applicant to stay at his premises but I have to look at other issues.
- The area has to be surfaced properly as operating the forklift can be dangerous.
- I have no problems in respect of planning terms but there were non planning implications such as hazard to workers due to the lime dust.

- The hours of operation should be 9.30 to 15.00 hours.
- The history of the site was that there had previously been a refusal.
- There was no problem with car parking.
- The access could be improved.

The applicant's agent confirmed that it would be predominantly a hard surface and it would be conditioned to make it all hard surface.

The Council's legal representative confirmed that you can't impose any extra conditions on an existing planning permission. You have to separate the two applications and look at the storage yard separately.

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

- There would be a mixed surface, a part of the site has been surfaced. It could be either tarmac or concrete.
- The first section of the site entrance needs to be a hard surface, details would be submitted.
- Protected characteristics of race refer to objectors being from an ethnic minority.
- The problem of the dust won't be totally eliminated.
- There was a balance between business and amenity concerns in respect of the application.
- The lime bin was taken outside.
- There were powers under the highways act to deal with problems on the highway.
- Water could be used to deal with the dust.
- There was the issue of jobs and the needs of the business and there had been bargaining in respect of the hours of operation and the company had offered not to operate on Saturdays.
- We can add a condition in respect of surfacing of the storage area, vehicular access and drainage.

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 condition 2 being amended as outlined in (1) below and with an additional condition as outlined in (2) below:

- (1) "Operations in connection with the storage of finished products or disposal of waste materials in the covered waste skip, including loading and unloading, shall not occur outside the hours of 09.30 to 15.00 hours Mondays to Fridays and not at all on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of neighbouring residents and to accord with Policies TM19A and D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (2) "At the same time as the surfacing of the storage area and car parking, the means of vehicular access from Parson Street shall be laid out, hard surfaced, sealed and drained within the site to a constructional specification**

to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

67. LAND AT SYKES MILL, DENHOLME ROAD, OXENHOPE, KEIGHLEY
Worth Valley

Full application for new dwelling and access on land adjacent to Sykes Mill, Denholme Road, Leeming, Oxenhope – 15/07332/FUL.

The application proposed amendments to a dwelling previously approved on this plot of land by the Area Planning Panel in 2013 (Reference 13/01943/FUL).

A Ward Councillor had requested the referral of this application to panel, in support of the objections.

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 14 objection letters had been received. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “O”.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposals here were somewhat balanced, in that there were some benefits for privacy of neighbours but these were offset by other aspects of the development, largely connected to the increase in projection of the accommodation towards the reservoir and the resulting additional massing of the upper levels of the building. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

A Ward Councillor had written in to the Panel making the following points:

- The development would cause major structural issues.
- Repair work was still outstanding.
- There would be an impact on the right to light.
- Buildings on the east would be affected more by the proposals.
- It was an imposing entrance and the scale and materials were not in keeping with other properties in the village.
- There were major access issues to the existing property.
- Residents and the nursery nearby were opposed to the application.
- My view was supported by the Conservation Officer.

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

- This was the fifth application for development on this site.
- The site was a key open space in the conservation area.
- The application was not in line with our village design statement.
- The development would not be in agreement with the conservation area.

- I support the view of the ward Councillor.
- The development was totally inappropriate.
- I acknowledge the previously granted planning application.
- The Planning Officer had not fully explored the response from the Conservation Officer, there was a two page report.
- The conservation recommendations were that the site was a key view and open space. It would not enhance the conservation area.
- It was a serious omission not to bring forward the Conservation Officer report.

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

- I live in the mill.
- Damage has been caused to my property.
- The development was a disruption and danger to other properties.
- My privacy would be affected.
- See the advice from the MP.
- There would be an impact on other properties and the light levels in my property would be affected. There were right to light guidelines that should be followed.
- My neighbours would be affected by the development.
- There would be an impact on 22 Denholme Road.
- The Conservation Officer comments were important.
- The development doesn't accord with policies D1, UDP3, BH7 and BH10.
- There were no suitable drainage proposals.
- The applicant had messed up the drainage on this land.
- Where would visitors park? Three parking spaces were needed.
- There was poor visibility and access to the site was dangerous.
- There were no structural proposals with the application.
- My engineers have highlighted concerns.
- This application should be deferred to assess the Conservation Officer comments.

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

- The applicant had reduced the size of the development.
- Approval was given in 2013.
- Can we build the same house but smaller.
- The Ward and Parish Councillors want no development on the site. The principle of development on the site has already been established.
- The objector wants the decision revoked.
- No one has opposed the reduction of the development.
- There was a massive reduction in the development. The width of the house and of the lower ground floor had been reduced.
- The size of the excavation was reduced.
- Our circumstances had changed and we don't need a big retirement home.
- It was a simpler and less costly build.
- We are taking measures to protect the privacy of neighbours.
- We would use the same materials as the original plan.
- I accept the conditions, we have no desire to sit on the roof and look at neighbours houses.
- There would be sufficient light to enter the mill.
- It was the same design and we would build a smaller retirement home, we have

- permission.
- The development was further away from the objector's home.
- Please approve the application.
- Damage was caused and was then repaired.

Members made the following comments:

- Can you clarify if the building has changed in mass?
- Was it to be a narrow longer building?
- Making the building larger was not the answer.
- Has the building moved much from its original planned location?
- Would there be some loss of view?
- Was there any flood history at the site?
- The view of the property to the east would be obstructed.
- Where was the nearest right of way?
- I want to see the Conservation Officer report. I am concerned about it.
- We need to see the conservation report.
- There was a for sale sign at the location, do you intend to live in the property?
- I am concerned about the digging issues.
- Was it a retirement home for the applicant?
- We would wait for the conservation report.
- I am not in favour of the application the applicant should build from the old application.
- I recommend approval of the application.

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

- The Conservation Officer had expressed concerns about the application.
- The building was set further into the site but some of the view would be lost.
- You can protect privacy by not allowing people to sit on the balcony roof.
- On balance I can support the application subject to conditions.
- The building has not moved much and has become bigger.
- Yes, it was to be a narrow longer building closer to the boundary.
- There would be some loss of view. You can't protect the view.
- There was not any flood risk.
- We are where we are, planning permission was granted. You can't go back to the principle of development of this site.
- Attention should be drawn to the benefits of the scheme.
- There was private action going on about excavation issues.

The applicant confirmed that as a result of what he considered to be a "venomous campaign" against the development his wife had not wanted to live in the property, but had now changed her mind. They wanted to build there and move into the property. No legal action was taking place at the moment.

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

68. THE MALT SHOVEL INN, WILSDEN ROAD, HARDEN, BINGLEY

Bingley Rural

Retrospective planning application for the construction of an outside timber shelter to accommodate a bar, till and servery in the rear garden of The Malt Shovel Inn, Wilsden Road, Harden, Bingley – 15/06916/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 Wilsden Parish Council supported this application. Seven representations were received objecting to the development. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “O”.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed development was considered to relate satisfactorily to the character of the existing building and adjacent properties. The impact of the proposal upon the occupants of neighbouring properties had been assessed but, subject to the suggested condition, it was considered that the shelter would not have a significant adverse effect upon their residential amenity. As such the proposal was considered to be in accordance with policies UR3 (The local impact of development), BH4A (Development within the setting of a listed building), P7 (Noise), and D1 (General design considerations) of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

Members made the following comments:

- Has the impact of the proposed application been assessed?
- There was no discernable impact on neighbours.
- Other establishments down the road use load speakers.
- They are very busy when the weather was nice.
- People have been drinking in the pub for a number of years.
- There would be no adverse impact due to the proposed application.
- I don't appreciate retrospective applications.
- There were no sensible planning grounds to refuse the application.
- The application should be approved.

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

- It was an obtrusive shelter. A beer garden was already there.
- Load speakers would be fixed to the structure.
- A new management of the pub was trying to improve the business which included using the shelter.
- There had been some noise complaints to environmental health.

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

**69. SADDLERS FARM, UPPER MARSH LANE, OXENHOPE,
KEIGHLEY**

Worth Valley

Full application for construction of timber lodge annex at Saddlers Farm, Upper Marsh Lane, Oxenhope, Keighley – 16/00073/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 Oxenhope Parish Council had objected to the application, they were unable to support the application as the timber lodge would encroach upon the Green Belt and therefore be contrary to Green Belt policy. No representations had been received.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported the reasons for refusal of the application as outlined on Document "O". He therefore recommended refusal of the application.

A Ward Councillor was in support of the application and had accepted that that development would be in the Green Belt but that there were special circumstances as an attempt was being made to help elderly relatives. The building was in keeping with the existing farm building.

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

- A medical report was submitted.
- There was an ageing population in the district and we need to cope with this.
- This application seeks planning support for care in the family.
- There was a need to support two close relatives rather than recreational use of the premises.
- The development would be some distance from Saddlers Farm. Some nursing places were a further distance away.
- The area was an unrestricted sprawl.
- The country faces problems coping with the care of elderly and infirm people. The planning system should help to find a solution to this problem.
- Self help and self finance in families should be applauded and supported.
- If horses can be housed at this location then people should also be housed there.

Members made the following comments:

- Were there any circumstances where the applicant could have domestic use?
- The Green Belt was there for a reason.
- An application had been approved for a stable for horses.
- I have sympathy for the applicants.
- The applicant could buy another place for their relatives to reside in.
- If the application was approved a dangerous precedent would be set.
- How do you define exceptional circumstances?
- The case in respect of this application did not qualify as exceptional circumstances.
- Oxenhope Parish Council could not support the application.
- This application included the issue of adult social care and any decision could be

treated as a precedent.

- I am not convinced that this was exceptional.
- It was an appropriate development for a limited period.
- The area was in the Green Belt.
- It was proposed to build an annexe close to the main residence. This was not exceptional circumstances.
- It was admirable that the applicant wanted to take care of their relatives.
- You can't put in a flood barrier in Bingley due to newts, there seems to be more care for animals than humans.
- This was a difficult case. Not many children volunteer to look after parents.
- Was the footprint the same as the stables?
- Could the proposed timber lodge annexe be used later on as stables?
- Annexes were usually attached to another building.
- I believe that the applicant was genuine but an approval of this application could open the door to disgenious applications.
- The application could be approved and after 15 years it could be checked if the elderly relatives were still there.
- A temporary personal permission for sole use of the building by the main persons could be granted.
- It could be checked on the electoral roll if the elderly relatives were still at the property. When they died the property would have to be knocked down.

The Council's legal representative responded that there were two issues, a separate permission and a personal permission. It was a question of special circumstances but very special circumstances did not exist in this case.

The applicant's agent confirmed that the the application could be approved for named residents only and when no longer needed could revert back to stables when the elderly relatives were no longer there. This would mean a personal permission would be granted.

The Council's legal representative responded that it would depend on when the elderly relatives were no longer there. To check the situation after 15 years would be too long a time.

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

- The applicant had provided medical details in respect of the occupants of the proposed lodge.
- A free standing annexe had already been extended.
- After personal consent was no longer required the building could be demolished.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the following reasons

The site is in the Green Belt within which a free standing residential annex beyond the curtilage of the dwelling house would be contrary to the presumption of inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Local Planning Authority

does not accept that the 'Very special circumstances' argued here are sufficient to clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm. The proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy GB1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

70. REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(i) **Land to rear of 171, 173 and 175 Bradford Road, Riddlesden** **Keighley East**

Land to rear of 171, 173 and 175 Bradford Road, Riddlesden – ENFUNA

The construction of two dwellings in this location was considered to be detrimental to highway safety and visual and residential amenity. The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 18 February 2016.

(ii) **2 View Road, Keighley** **Keighley Central**

Construction of a single storey side and rear extension – 15/00043/ENFUNA.

The unauthorised development was considered to be detrimental to residential and visual amenity. The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 18 February 2016.

(iii) **3 Burley Court, Steeton with Eastburn** **Craven**

Construction of a garage outbuilding – 15/00246/TPOCN.

The outbuilding was considered to be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety and to the health and longevity of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 3 February 2016.

(iv) **Land at Swartha House Farm, Swartha Lane, Silsden** **Craven**

Failure to comply with condition – 15/00019/ENFCON.

The lack of a suitably formed access was considered to be detrimental to highways safety and both visual and residential amenity.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 2 February 2016.

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

Construction of raised platform and the installation of doors to the front elevation of the premises – 16/00076/ENFUNA.

The unauthorised raised platform due to its siting and scale was detrimental to the visual amenity of the existing property and wider surrounding area including the traditionally constructed building at The Old Glen House. The unauthorised French doors have an adverse impact on the front elevation of this traditional stone building due to their materials and style. The development was therefore contrary to Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 29 February 2016.

Resolved –

That the report be noted.

NO ACTION

71. DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEALS ALLOWED

(i) **2 Woodlands Court, Bingley**

Bingley

Retrospective application for amendments to planning permission 14/00468/HOU dated 02.04.2014: Construction of two-storey side extension with single-storey porch - Case No: 15/02507/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00143/APPHOU

(ii) **Fernhill, Jew Lane, Oxenhope, Keighley**

Worth Valley

Conversion of existing garage into garden room and gym and construction of extension to create new double garage - Case No: 15/03668/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00139/APPHOU

(iii) **Ivy Cottage, Hob Cote Lane, Oakworth, Keighley**

Worth Valley

Replacement conservatory, and new rear first floor windows - Case No: 15/00957/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00107/APPHOU

(iv) **Ivy Cottage, Hob Cote Lane, Oakworth, Keighley**

Worth Valley

Replacement conservatory, and new rear first floor windows - Case No: 15/00950/LBC

Appeal Ref: 15/00133/APPLB2

(v) **Land at Widdon Croft 5, Whiddon Croft, Menston, Ilkley**

Wharfedale

Construction of one detached dwelling on land adjoining - Case No: 15/01204/FUL

Appeal Ref: 15/00119/APPFL2

APPEALS DISMISSED

(vi) **49 Cliffe Street, Keighley**

Keighley Central

Retrospective planning application for construction of front and rear dormer windows -
Case No: 15/03829/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00136/APPHOU

(vii) **64 Mannville Road, Keighley**

Keighley Central

Construction of single storey rear extension of the following dimensions:
Depth of extension from original rear wall: 5M. Maximum height of extension: 4M
Height to eaves of extension: 3M - Case No: 15/02855/PNH

Appeal Ref: 15/00134/APPNH1

(viii) **Mount Pleasant Farm, Black Moor Road, Oxenhope,
Keighley**

Worth Valley

Demolition of existing porch and construction of two storey rear extension - Case No:
15/03540/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00142/APPHOU

(ix) **Wilsden Cricket Club, Haworth Road, Wilsden, Bradford**

Bingley Rural

Retrospective application for sponsor's illuminated advertising board attached to northern
gable of pavilion - Case No: 15/02287/ADV

Appeal Ref: 15/00129/APPAD1

APPEAL ALLOWED IN PART / PART DISMISSED

(x) **9 Malvern Crescent, Riddlesden, Keighley**

Keighley East

Construction of rear extension allowed on appeal/balcony dismissed on appeal - Case No:
15/03183/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00148/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 Panel.**