

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley & Shipley) held on Monday 27 April 2016 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 1005
Concluded 1225

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR
Miller	Bacon
M Pollard	Farley
	Abid Hussain
	Lee

Apologies: Councillor Shabir Hussain and Councillor Naylor

Councillor Abid Hussain in the Chair

72. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Bacon was a resident of Wilsden, had been to the premises but had not discussed the application in relation to Minute 75 (a).

Councillor Abid Hussain knew the applicants, as they lived in his Ward but had not discussed the application in relation to Minute 75 (e).

Councillor Lee was acquainted with the applicants but had not discussed the application in relation to Minute 75 (e).

Councillor Miller had not discussed any of the planning applications on the agenda.

ACTION: Interim City Solicitor

73. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

74. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.



75. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS

The Strategic Director, Regeneration presented **Document “Q”** and **“R”**. Plans and photographs were displayed and/or tabled in respect of each application and representations summarised.

(a) **126 Main Street, Wilsden**

Bingley Rural

Application for variation of condition 4 - to extend the permitted opening hours imposed under planning permission 12/03274/FUL dated 13.11.2012: Change of use from retail (A1) to cafe (A3) at 126 Main Street, Wilsden - 16/01411/VOC

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application requested an extension to the opening hours and that a previous proposal had been supported, however, objections had been received from the adjoining property and the needs of the business had to be balanced against those of residential amenity. The applicant had now requested extended opening hours on a morning and a weekend, stating that the current hours were not conducive to the provision of food. A Ward Councillor had supported the proposal and had indicated that the revised hours would be positive for the village. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the Parish Council were in favour and a petition had been received in support of the application, however, an objection had been received though not from the adjoining neighbour. It was noted that the Council wanted to support the proposal and were mindful of the residential amenity, however, it was a small business and would not pose a significant effect. The proposed extended opening times were believed to be acceptable and it was suggested that the business hours inside the premises be recommended for approval. With regard to the garden area to the rear of the building, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the Council's Environmental Health Unit had been consulted and had raised concerns. He explained that discussions had been undertaken with the current owner of the business, however, the ownership could change in the future, therefore, it was proposed that the operating hours of the outside space be limited to 2000 hours. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

- If a customer sat outside after the requested hours, the premises would be in breach of its conditions.
- The premise was licensed.
- The premises did not directly overlook the row of cottages, as there was a building in between.
- The public house had a beer garden to the rear.
- The objection was not from a near neighbour.

A Parish Councillor was present at the meeting and raised the following concerns:

- The Ward Councillor and the Parish Council supported the application.
- The application requested longer opening hours inside and outside the premises for 3 nights per week and did not include Sunday or Bank Holidays.
- The rear yard stated that it could accommodate 20 to 22 people, however, it would be very cramped.

- Wilsden was a small quiet village.
- It was not envisaged that there would be a large increase in patrons or traffic.
- Business in the village needed to be encouraged.
- The application should be approved.

During the discussion a Member suggested that the use of the external area behind the premises should not be limited to 2000 hours. Another Member then questioned the distance between the public house and the premises. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that there were buildings between the two properties.

Resolved –

That the application to vary condition 4 under planning permission 12/03274/FUL be approved as amended below:

The premises the subject of this decision shall not be open for business outside the hours of:

Monday to Wednesday: 07.30 to 18.00

Thursday and Friday: 07.30 to 22.00

Saturday: 09.00 to 22.00

Sundays and Bank or Public holidays: 10.00 to 16.00

No customer shall be served or otherwise make use of the premises outside these hours.

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(b) Hindleigh, Gawthorpe Lane, Bingley

Bingley

Full application for construction of a detached house and garage at Hindleigh, Gawthorpe Lane, Bingley - 16/01240/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was for the construction of a detached house and garage in an existing residential garden space. Access to the site would be gained through the current gateway on Gawthorpe Lane and would be subject to widening improvements, which had been accepted as satisfactory by the Council's Highways Department due to the low traffic speeds in the vicinity. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that there was a mixture of property types in the area and the proposed two storey standard dwelling would not appear out of place. The site was capable of development and was residential in character due to it being an existing garden space. He confirmed that concerns had been raised in relation to the proposed property's relationship with 'Holly Lodge' and its loss of privacy, however, it was believed that no significant harm would be caused due to the difference in land levels and the well established hedge along the boundary. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to Members' queries, the Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that:

- The proposed dwelling would be sited approximately 12 metres from 'Holly Lodge.
- The usual distance required between properties was 21 metres, however, this could vary.
- The proposed property would have south facing windows in the upper floor and on the west facing wall, however, there would be a distance of 12 metres between the properties.
- The access would be widened and the boundary wall lowered to 900 millimetres to allow visibility, which would improve the sight line.
- Permitted development rights could be removed in order to prevent a fence being erected.
- Matching materials of natural stone and tiles would be used.
- No inaccuracies in the plans had been identified on the site visit.

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

- The proposal would be at the same level as the bedrooms and roof of 'Holly Lodge'.
- Natural daylight came through the proposed location and the development would restrict the light.
- The solid structure of the proposal would limit the light into the bedrooms and living area of 'Holly Lodge'.
- The removal of trees in the past had resulted in 'Holly Lodge' benefitting from additional natural light.
- He had been led to believe that the height of the proposed house would be reduced to the level of the bottom of the hedge.
- Photographs had been submitted to the Council's Planning Department to outline the light issues.
- The report stated that "the well established hedgerow" would mitigate the privacy issues, but it would be insignificant.
- How had it been justified that the reduction in height would reduce the impact on neighbours and not compromise privacy and light, as no-one had been to 'Holly Lodge'.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the proposal would have an impact on the morning light, however, a possible solution would be to hip the gable backwards and a condition to this effect could be placed on the application if Members were minded to grant approval. The loss of light would not be significant and in the event of an appeal the request would have to be justified, however, an alternative design could be considered.

Members raised further queries and were informed that the height of the proposed property could be re-considered. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that he had only visited the application site and the applicant had not been requested to submit any light surveys. It was noted that the roof design could be altered if necessary and the light to 'Holly Lodge' would be affected.

The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and stated that:

- Seven points of concern had been raised in relation to the proposal, six related to the development and one to the process.

- With regard to light and privacy matters, there would still be a significant gap between the properties to allow natural daylight. A 12 metre gap would be maintained and if the Council had major concerns the applicant could have been requested to supply light surveys.
- The boundary hedge would be retained and there were no serious privacy implications.
- No amendments had been requested and no concerns had been raised in respect of the drawings.
- The Council's Highways Department had not raised any concerns.
- The existing access would be significantly improved and a turning space provided on site.
- The development would not create any obstructions, as a double garage would be constructed.
- The existing property would retain its double garage and parking space.
- The site was an acceptable infill plot in a residential area.
- Natural stone and slate would be used in order to reflect the traditional styles in the vicinity.
- The proposed conditions had been reviewed and the applicant had agreed that permitted development rights could also be removed.

During the discussion Members agreed in principle to the development, however, concerns were raised in relation to the design of the roof, the loss of natural light to 'Holly Lodge', the boundary hedge, the distance between the existing and proposed properties and overshadowing. It was then suggested that the application be deferred in order for further investigations to be undertaken.

Resolved –

That consideration of the application be deferred to a future meeting in order to allow further amendments and investigations into the roof design; finished levels and clarification of the impact on sunlight/daylight to the adjoining property through natural light surveys.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(c) Land to the Rear of St Matthew's Close, Wilsden

Bingley Rural

Outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of 6 dwellings on 0.7Ha of land at Moorside Farm to the rear of St Matthews Close, Wilsden - 16/00540/OUT

The Strategic Director, Regeneration then gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application was outline and that only the principle of development was to be considered. The site was an unallocated triangular piece of land, that benefited from dense tree screening and the proposal would use the existing approved access. A number of objections had been received that raised concerns in relation to an increase in traffic on the local road network and access via a residential area. It was noted that improvements to the junction were included on the previously approved application. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the two fields were excluded from the Green Belt, however, it was the Parish Council's intention to include them a part of a green space within their Neighbourhood Plan. He

stated that the Council's Highway Department had indicated that the proposed access was achievable and would be considered at the reserved matters stage, as it would require a Section 278 Agreement. The proposal would provide six new dwellings and the design would be considered at the reserved matters stage. Members were informed that the Parish Council had urged the refusal of the application quoting the Wilsden Neighbourhood Plan, which identified the land as village space, however, it was at an early stage and the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the Council was unable to refuse the development on these grounds. He explained that the existing tree screen would prevent the loss of views and privacy and then recommended the application for approval.

In response to questions, Members were informed that:

- Neighbourhood Plans had been introduced under recent legislation and needed to be considered by the Council's Executive Committee, therefore, they could only be given limited weight at this point.
- It was a steep site and there may be wet areas, however, there was the potential to capture the surface water run off and provide benefits for existing properties.
- Any flood water would be piped away separately.
- Approximately four vehicle movements per hour would be generated for six dwellings.
- The public right of way followed the boundary and was in between the properties and the stone wall. There was no intention to close the pathway and there was the potential for it to be improved.
- The site was enclosed by Green Belt on the western and northern boundaries.
- The police had not been consulted, however, the security on the public right of way could be increased.
- Six different designed properties had been proposed.
- The police had not been consulted as the application was for outline planning permission and provided very little detail. Pathways behind properties were not encouraged and there was an opportunity to improve the security.

A Parish Councillor was present at the meeting and outlined the following concerns:

- The Parish Council did not support the application.
- The land to the north of the site had approval for the construction of seven dwellings that the Parish Council had rejected.
- This application was dependent upon the previous scheme for the construction of seven houses.
- The Neighbourhood Plan had progressed and was only a couple of months away from submission.
- Wilsden residents were being denied their democratic right.
- There was no way of knowing what had been proposed in respect of the public right of way.
- The site was steep and water logged.
- Concerns had been raised that the developer would cause water problems for neighbouring properties.
- Soakaways were not suitable.
- The access was poor and inadequate via the previous site.
- The application should be rejected.

In response to further queries from Members, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the previous application was outline and had been submitted and approved in 2015. He explained that timescales could not be set in respect of the full development and that any issues needed to be resolved at this point. It was reiterated that only the principle of development was for consideration. Members noted that access to the site had been identified from Wellington Road and would have to be built to serve this proposal.

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

- The proposal was a natural extension to the Phase 1 application.
- The red line boundary included the access road.
- Phase 2 included the access road and Phase 1 did not have to be completed.
- The issue for consideration was the principle of development.
- All other issues would be considered at the reserved matters stage.
- The right of public way would be retained.
- The Council's Highways Department had been consulted in respect of the access and were satisfied with the proposal.
- The application complied with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Council policies.
- The application should be approved.

In response to a query regarding the Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan, the City Solicitor reported that decision making still had to continue, as the Plan was still in its early stages. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that Neighbourhood Plans were emerging and they had to show conformity with Bradford's plans and the NPPF, which they may have to be tested against.

Members then acknowledged that they had to consider the submitted application and could not take the Neighbourhood Plan into account at this time.

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

(d) **Land West of 3 Dewhirst Street, Wilsden**

Bingley Rural

Full (retrospective) planning application for the retention of two dwellings at land West of 3 Dewhirst Street, Wilsden - 15/07009/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was retrospective for the retention of two dwellings located within a densely developed part of the conservation area that had been built under planning permission granted in 2010/11 and were now occupied. It was reported that the development had been subject to a number of conditions, one of which required the widening of the connecting road and a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). The alignment of the properties was also different to that

approved. The Strategic Director, Regeneration acknowledged that the application was retrospective, however, the planning merits had to be considered. He confirmed that the houses were in the same general area and did not create any detriments. The roof was not stepped, however, the design incorporated the features of houses in the area and not all were stepped. Natural stone had been used in the construction and no objections had been submitted in relation to the quality of the materials used. The hard surface materials, fencing and landscaping had not been specified, though a more durable fence would be more appropriate than the functional one in situ. Members were informed that a low stone wall around the site and a boundary wall around the tarmac parking area had now been proposed. It was noted that Wilsden Parish Council had requested that the previously required highway works were undertaken. The Council's Highways Department had reviewed the requirements and confirmed that the widening of the connecting road and TRO were no longer necessary and had therefore withdrawn their previous objections. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that:

- The implementation of a TRO would be decided by the Area Committee.
- The land used for parking was owned by the developer.
- The revised plans identified walls and planting but not any marked parking areas.

A Parish Councillor was present at the meeting and raised the following issues:

- The development had been a travesty from start to finish.
- The developer had little regard for planning and highway policies.
- The Parish Council had concerns with the development.
- The property had been altered since complaints had been lodged.

Discussions ensued and the Chair stated that the conditions needed to be enforced and additional ones added in respect of a permeable parking surface, a wall to the boundary and the marking of the car parking bays. In response the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the walls were covered in the plan, however, an investigation would be required in relation to a permeable surface.

Resolved –

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

- (i) **The off street parking area adjoining the dwellings shall be resurfaced using porous materials, or made to direct run off to a permeable or porous area within 3 months of the date of this permission (unless the Local Planning Authority has agreed to an alternative timetable for completion). The type and colour of these permeable materials shall first be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, and to secure satisfactory sustainable drainage to accord with policies UR3, TM12 and NR16 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (ii) **The off street car parking spaces shown on the approved site plan shall be marked into numbered bays allocated to the two dwellings and shall be kept available for this use whilst ever the dwellings are occupied. The car parking facility so provided shall not be used for any other purpose.**

Reason: To ensure provision of adequate off street parking for the use, in the interests of highway safety and to accord with Policy TM12 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(e) **Low Lodge, Belgrave Road, Keighley**

Keighley Central

Full application for the construction of a pair of semi-detached dwellings on land at Low Lodge, Belgrave Road, Keighley - 16/00163/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed the construction of a pair of semi-detached houses on land behind Low Lodge, which was within the grounds of the Grade II listed Laurel Mount and in a conservation area. Members were informed that the tree cover was important to the conservation area and the open space was essential for the setting of the listed building. The properties would have a larger footprint than Low Lodge and materials proposed were reconstituted stone and slate. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that previous applications on the site had been refused and confirmed that the proposal was similar to previous schemes. The main change was that parking provision would be available to the front of the properties, however, the development was still unacceptable due to the harm to the conservation area, listed building and the proximity to tree cover. A number of representations in support, objection and a petition had been submitted. The Council's Conservation Team were opposed to development in the grounds of Laurel Mount and indicated that the submitted Design and Access Statement had not considered the impact. An objection from the Victorian Society stated that the proposal was too close to the Lodge, use unsuitable materials and have a substantial harm on the listed building and conservation area. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that a tree report had been submitted by the applicant, however, the Council's Tree officer disagreed with the survey as the siting and scale of the dwellings was the same as previous refusals. The report indicated that the number of trees needed to be reduced in order to facilitate construction and the Council did not support this course of action, as all the trees were protected and important in the conservation area. The gardens and the rear rooms would also be in the shade. The proposal was unacceptable development and had not overcome the previous issues, therefore, it was recommended for refusal.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to Members queries and confirmed that:

- Both the Council's Conservation and Heritage and Tree officers were against the application.
- The dwellings would be seen in the view of Laurel Mount.
- The occupiers of Low Lodge had not objected.
- The house would be for a disabled person.

The applicant's agent addressed the meeting and made the following statements:

- There was not a planning policy that stated buildings could not be constructed near to listed buildings.
- The tree coverage was dependant on the time of year.
- The scheme was similar to previous proposals.
- The gable had been reduced by 900mm, the width to the west had been reduced by 700mm and car parking had been provided to the front of the properties.
- The footprint of Plot 1 had been reduced by 5.5% and the ridge of Plot 2 had been lowered.
- The mass of the property had been reduced which had lessened its impact.
- The Tree Officer's comments had been considered and a relevant report had been provided.
- The materials could be changed to natural stone and timber windows.
- Details of the disabled access had been submitted.
- It was national policy to allocate land for development.

During the discussion, a Member commented that the canopy of the trees was above the height of the houses and indicated that the applicant had complied with officer's requests. It was noted that an offer to use natural stone and timber windows had been made and there were other new buildings in the area.

Another Member questioned whether any pruning had been carried out on the trees and who the Victorian Society were. In response he was informed that no work had been undertaken and that the Victorian Society was a national organisation. The Council had not consulted them, so it had been presumed that an objector had contacted them and they had provided a comment on the application.

The discussion ensued and a Member stated that he did not believe that there was a great deal of linkage between Low Lodge and Laurel Mount and was unsure that the view would be interrupted. It was noted that the distance between the Lodge and the new properties would be 2 metres at the closest point. A Member suggested that, in light of the previous concerns being addressed and the reduction in size, the application be approved subject to an additional condition regarding the use of natural stone and the matching of materials.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

The proposed development would not be visually intrusive or incongruous and not cause substantial harm to the setting of the listed building or the conservation area. The benefit obtained by enabling a disabled person and their family to remain within the community would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets. The materials used and the trees may be protected by conditions. The development would therefore comply with the Council's Replacement Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

And that the application be subject to the following conditions:

- (i) **The development to which this notice relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.**

Reason: To accord with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

- (ii) Notwithstanding details of materials specified on the approved drawings, the dwellings shall be constructed using coursed natural stone and timber framed windows. Before development commences on site, arrangements shall be made with the Local Planning Authority for the inspection of all facing and roofing materials to be used in the development hereby permitted. The samples shall then be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development constructed in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials in the interests of visual amenity and to safeguard the appearance of the Conservation Area in which it is located and to accord with Policies UR3, D1 and BH7 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (iii) The development shall not be begun, nor shall there be any works of site preparation, groundworks, or materials or machinery brought on to the site until temporary Tree Protective Fencing has been erected around the canopy spreads of all protected trees to be retained within and adjoining the development site.**

The protective fencing shall meet specifications contained in BS 5837 Trees In Relation To Construction, and shall be installed in accordance with a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement setting out tree protection measures and appropriate working practices that shall be prepared in accordance with the recommendation in the applicant's Arboricultural Impact Analysis by Skerratt Tree Consultants Reference 392 B (dated 10.12.2015).

Upon completion of the tree protection measures, the Local Planning Authority shall be informed in writing and no work shall be begun until it has confirmed in writing that the tree protection measures are satisfactory.

The Tree Protection measures shall remain in location for the duration of the development. No excavations, engineering works, service runs and installations shall take place between the temporary Tree Protective Fencing and the protected trees without written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure trees are protected during the construction period and in the interests of visual amenity. To safeguard the visual amenity provided by the trees and to accord with Policies NE4, NE5 and NE6 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (iv) Before any part of the development hereby permitted is brought into use, the off-street car parking facility shall be constructed of porous materials, or made to direct run-off water from a hard surface to a permeable or porous area within the curtilage of the site, and laid out in accordance with approved drawing 633-201F with a gradient no steeper than 1 in 15.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, drainage and to accord with policies UR3, TM12 and NR16 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(f) **Request for Enforcement/Prosecution Action**

(i) **79 Goose Cote Lane, Keighley**

Keighley West

A timber and plastic boundary enclosure - 15/00490/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 8 March 2016.

(ii) **Catton Woods, Stead Hall Farm, Burley in Wharfedale**

Wharfedale

Paintballing and the siting of ancillary structures, tyres, barrels, netting and fencing - 13/00303/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 31 March 2016.

(iii) **Land at Thornhill Road, Steeton with Eastburn**

Craven

Breach of hours of construction - 16/00056/ENFCON

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers 18 March 2016.

(iv) **Land at Low Lodge, Belgrave Road, Keighley**

Keighley Central

Siting of a metal container on the land - 14/00737/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 15 March 2016.

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(i) **Decisions Made by the Secretary of State**

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

APPEAL ALLOWED

(i) **10 Drysdale Way, Haworth, Keighley**

Worth Valley

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 15/00374/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00146/APPENF

APPEALS DISMISSED

(ii) **178 Skipton Road, Keighley**

Keighley Central

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 12/00723/ENFAPP

Appeal Ref: 15/00106/APPENF

(iii) **2 View Road, Keighley**

Keighley Central

Retrospective planning application for demolition of existing pre-fabricated garage and construction of new garage - Case No: 15/06624/HOU

Appeal Ref: 16/00016/APPHOU

(iv) **21 Belmont Avenue, Baildon**

Baildon

Construction of detached house - Case No: 15/02461/FUL

Appeal Ref: 15/00135/APPFL2

(v) **6 Todley Hall Farm, Todley Hall Road, Laycock, Keighley**

Worth Valley

Retention of a replacement conservatory and replacement of windows and rear door - Case No: 15/06091/HOU

Appeal Ref: 16/00014/APPHOU

(vi) **The Haven, St Mary's Road, Riddlesden, Keighley**

Keighley East

Construction of detached dwelling - Case No: 15/00628/FUL

Appeal Ref: 15/00138/APPFL2

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\plks27April

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