

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 21 March 2018 in the Council Chamber - Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 10.05 am
Concluded 12.10 pm

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	THE INDEPENDENTS
Miller	Lee Amran Greenwood Mullaney	Naylor

Observers: Councillor M Smith (Minute 39(c)) and Councillor M Slater (Minute 39 (f))

Apologies: Councillor Naveed Riaz

Councillor Lee in the Chair

35. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Miller disclosed that, having lived in this area for a lengthy period, he may know people associated with any of the applications but he had not discussed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties.

Councillor Lee disclosed that there was an application pertaining to her ward (Keighley East), but she had not discussed any of the matters relating to that application with any interested parties.

During consideration of The Bungalow, Florist Street, Keighley (Minute 39(g)), Councillor Miller disclosed that he had been to the applicant's shop, but had not discussed the application.

Action: City Solicitor

36. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2018 be signed as a correct record.

37. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

38. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

39. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

The Strategic Director, Place presented **Document “M”**. Plans and photographs were displayed in respect of each application and representations summarised.

(a) 2B Westcliffe Avenue, Baildon

Baildon

Householder application for a first floor front extension and a single storey rear extension at 2B Westcliffe Avenue, Baildon - 18/00153/HOU

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(b) 50 Burley Lane, Menston, Ilkley

Wharfedale

Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission 14/01653/FUL (this condition was added by non-material amendment 14/01653/NMA01) - 17/05321/VOC

The Strategic Director, Place informed Members that the application was to vary a condition of planning permission previously granted in 2014 for the construction of a detached dwelling with integral garage. The application proposed to alter the schedule of approved drawings and permit amendments to the layout, vehicular turning area, relationship with the adjacent dwelling and amenity space of the approved dwelling. He reported that works had commenced on the site and stated that the application proposed modest revisions which were not considered to amount to material alterations to the original application. Design changes to the front elevation were also considered relatively modest and included a second gable fronted feature and reduction in the size of the windows proposed. He stated that some of the points raised by objectors related to the principle of the development, which was not being considered as permission for the development had already been granted. He reported that a letter of support had recently been

received from a neighbouring property expressing full support for the application and stating that they were the most directly affected by the proposed changes which they considered to provide them with more privacy. He considered the amended proposed materials were an improvement to those previously approved. The application was then recommended for approval subject to conditions.

In response to a Member's questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that the height of the proposed ridge was 7.2m as opposed to 7.1m in the previously approved application.

A representative of Menston Parish Council was present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- The Parish Council welcomed the use of natural stone but considered the house to be slightly out of character with the neighbouring property.
- The Parish Council did not object to the variation of the condition but had concerns about the access for construction traffic due to the narrowness of Burley Lane.
- He suggested an additional condition be placed on the application to state that site traffic had to be parked on the site and not on Burley Lane.

An objector was present at the meeting and commented that:

- He did not consider the correct procedure was being followed in line with Section 73 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 and believed that the full planning application should be re-submitted.
- He stated there was no definition of 'minor' amendments and did not consider the variation of the condition to be a minor amendment.
- The new application would mean that the house was situated closer to the railway.
- The new design of the house made it a larger property with a smaller garden, restricted car parking and a limited turning area.
- The road was narrow and he was aware of one accident involving a cyclist being knocked down.
- He urged the Panel to undertake a site visit to see the sharp bend on the road which lacked visibility.
- If the Panel were minded to approve the application, a condition should be placed on it to not allow any weekend construction work on the site.

The City Solicitor advised the Panel that she was satisfied the correct legal procedure was being followed in terms of this application.

The Strategic Director, Place, stated that he was satisfied that this application and the associated application (Minute 39 (e)) created more space on the site than the previously approved application and therefore did not worsen the impact.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

**(c) Beacon House, Riverside Business Park,
Dansk Way, Ilkley**

Ilkley

Application for the variation of condition 3 (permitted hours) of planning permission 15/02269/FUL dated: 21 July 2015 - 17/06326/VOC

The Strategic Director, Place informed Members that the application was to vary a condition of planning permission previously granted in 2015. He provided a summary of the site history, outlining that the original application had been granted with a condition (2) that the premises would only be used for a power lifting/weight training gym. A further application to remove condition 2 was refused but allowed on appeal by the Planning Inspector. It allowed for further gym/fitness activities including martial arts and fitness training. The application was to vary condition 3 to allow the premises to be used as a gym/fitness centre for three additional hours between 6.00am and 9.00am, Monday to Friday. 32 representations in support of the application and five objections against it had been received, including one from a Ward Councillor raising concerns about the impact on the car parking availability for other businesses located within the Business Park. The Planning Inspector had not considered car parking to be a significant issue in approving the removal of condition 2. The applicant stated that the extension of the opening hours would allow the gym to meet demand for early hours fitness activities, prior to people starting work and the peak would be 6.00am until 7.30am/8.00am and would not impact on the car parking for other businesses in the area. The applicant also stated that the additional hours would improve the competitiveness of the business. He reported that the gym had 16 car parking spaces and there were also spaces for parking on the access road. Since the previous application, parking bays had been clearly marked on the site. He stated that complaints had been made to environmental health about the noise from the gym, however, the Environmental Health Officer had raised no concerns in relation to this application. The Ward Councillor had raised concerns regarding the noise impact on adjoining businesses and nearby residential properties, however the closest residential properties were located on Kimberly Street, at least a main road width away and the Environmental Health Officer did not anticipate there would be an issue of excess noise impacting on them. The application was then recommended for approval.

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

- Vibrations and sounds were being transmitted through to the adjoining building and this had not yet been resolved by the Environmental Health Officer.
- The Planning Inspector had included the whole of the car park in his assessment and did not take account of the remaining business users.
- The number of car parking spaces at the business park were inadequate for the proposal to increase the operating hours at the gym.

A representative on behalf of an objector addressed the Panel and made the following comments:

- He was making representation of behalf of the owner of Unit B of the Business Park which had three tenants.
- The proposed hours were not outside normal business hours of adjoining

businesses as they worked from 8.00am till 6.00pm during the week and on Saturdays as required.

- It was apparent from the overspill parking on Leeds Road and Dansk Way that the gym required more car parking spaces than were available on the site.
- The expansion of the operating hours of the gym should not be to the detriment of other businesses.
- The noise from the gym had been raised with the Environmental Health department in 2017 and he considered there to be an undue delay in resolving this matter.
- A condition should be imposed on the gym for further sound proofing and he suggested that classes including loud music should only be allowed after 6.00pm.
- Businesses on the site needed to co-exist and a fair balance should be achieved.

The City Solicitor advised the Panel that the matter before them was in relation to condition 3 only concerning the extension of the opening hours for the premises. It was not possible to impose conditions on the gym in relation to noise abatement. Environmental Health had investigated noise complaints and had not found any issues to be addressed therefore it would be unreasonable to impose conditions requiring soundproofing. Any future noise complaints could be addressed via that separate regime.

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

- Only the hours of use were being considered as part of the application.
- The officer's report stated that the Environmental Health Officer had investigated complaints about noise and concluded that no further action was deemed necessary.
- There had been an inference from previous speakers that the car park was shared, however, the gym had 16 car parking spaces on the site which were clearly marked.
- There were no reasonable grounds to state that the car parking was inadequate for three additional three of operation.
- In response to the Ward Councillor's comment, the Planning Inspector had not failed to understand the car parking position. She had considered that the gym had its own car parking spaces.
- The application proposed a modest change.
- The gym was a small facility.
- The gym had carried out a survey of the car park which showed that there were always spaces available in the designated gym car parking spaces.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(d) Land 408451 438335, Back O' The Mill, Bingley Bingley Rural

Full planning application for the construction of four 3-bedroom, 2-storey houses including associated car parking on land at Back O' The Mill, Keighley Road, Harden, Bingley - 17/06037/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the proposed development was for two pairs of semi-detached houses on land adjoining the car park of the Golden Fleece public house and that the site had a narrow access leading off Long Lane. The land was previously occupied by a two-storey workshop building which had been demolished in 2015. The Council's Highway Officer had advised that access for construction traffic and subsequent vehicular access by the future occupiers of the houses should be taken via Parry Close and the estate roads which emerge onto Keighley Road. In order to facilitate this, the existing bollard closure across the access would need to be removed and relocated to allow access from Parry Close whilst continuing to prevent through traffic 'rat running' from Long Lane. A number of objections had been received in relation to the proposed access, however, following assessment of the estate roads, they were considered able to accommodate the additional traffic. The relocation of the bollards would need the applicant to enter into a Section 278 legal agreement with the Council to carry out works on the highway, at the developer's expense. Separation distances were achieved with the nearest neighbouring property (No. 19 Parry Close). Trees would need to be removed as part of the proposal, but they were of poor condition and not protected by tree preservation orders. The application proposed six parking spaces for the four dwellings which met the required standards and was therefore considered acceptable. The application was then recommended for approval subject to conditions.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that the narrow lane behind the public house would not be accessible for through traffic and that the objection received from the adjoining property, No. 19 Parry Close, was in relation to overlooking onto their conservatory from two windows in the side elevation of Unit 4 of the proposed development. Those windows of Unit 4 served a toilet and staircase/landing and were not habitable rooms therefore presenting no significant impact in terms of loss of privacy and a condition was suggested to require that the first floor windows in the side wall of Unit 4 be fitted with obscure glass.

A representative of Harden Parish Council was present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- Harden Parish Council accepted the proposal in principle but had concerns about the access arrangements for construction traffic.
- There were concerns of safety due to the lack of pavement on Parry Close.
- That a condition should be imposed to restrict the hours of construction traffic on the site and for wheel washing of vehicles to take place on the site.
- Access was required to the Mill Pond. The gate at the steps at the bottom of Mill Pond was in place for security purposes only; it had public access and Bradford Council were aware of this matter.
- That the perimeter walls should be refurbished and retained.

The applicant was present at the meeting and informed Members that:

- He was agreeable to the access times for construction traffic as suggested by the Parish Councillor.
- The proposal would see investment in drainage for the Mill Pond which had not been invested in for some time.
- Drainage in the area would be improved as a result of the proposal.
- There were currently significant problems in relation to anti-social behaviour at the Mill Pond and the proposal would improve this situation.
- The removal of the bollards would also benefit the area as people were parking inconsiderately near them at present.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

**(e) Land adjacent to High Doat/Hazelmere,
Burley Lane, Menston**

Wharfedale

Full planning application for construction of detached dwelling, landscaping, parking and associated works - utilising existing access approved under 14/01653/FUL at land adjacent to High Doat/Hazelmere, Burley Lane, Menston - 17/06333/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the proposed development was on a site which had existing planning permission for a single dwelling and included part of the private garden area for that dwelling. The proposed dwelling would present a side elevation gable end to Burley Lane and its front elevation would be facing the driveway, which some objections had referred to as being out of keeping with the local character. However, it was not considered detrimental to the local character due to the variation of individually designed properties on Burley Lane with no strict uniform building line. 17 objections had been received including one from Clarence Drive Residents Association on the grounds of traffic safety issues, poor sight lines and that they considered the proposal to be lacking footway/driveway space. Menston Parish Council had also objected to the proposal on grounds of the proposal being out of keeping with the area as well as safety concerns. He reported that the proposed dwelling would have shared access with the previously approved dwelling on the site and would have three car parking spaces. Due to the close proximity to the railway, Network Rail required a safety barrier to be constructed around the car parking area to prevent vehicles entering the railway land. Emails had been received from the applicant evidencing his discussions with Network Rail in relation to this matter.

A representative of Menston Parish Council was present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- Due to the orientation of the proposed dwelling, it would have a gable end immediately fronting Burley Lane which would be unusual and out of character for the lane.
- All other houses on Burley Lane had a range of amenity space sizes but amenity space was limited on the proposal.
- The Parish Council did not consider the site to be suitable for two dwellings as they would appear cramped. The site was only suitable for one dwelling.
- Due to the narrowness of Burley Lane, it was not safe to reverse out on to it, therefore it was imperative that cars could egress from the site in a forward manner onto Burley Lane.
- There should be a hammer head turning facility on site to allow cars to exit the site in a forward manner.

In response to a comment made, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that there was sufficient space for cars to access and egress from the site without the need to reverse onto Burley Lane.

An objector was present at the meeting and commented that:

- The house would be out of character with other houses on Burley Lane.
- The key issue was that the gable would be facing the road.
- He considered the proposal to be intrusive to the lane and contrary to planning policy D1, paragraph 4.
- The principle of the development should be sympathetic and in keeping with the area, which he did not consider to be the case.
- The proposal would be a visual eye sore.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place stated that planning policy D1, paragraph 4, as referred to by the objector, related to the design policy in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, which had been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan Document. He stated it was a guidance document which required a judgement as to what was in keeping with the character of the local area.

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

- A vehicle tracking plan had been undertaken to evidence that cars could park adequately on the site.
- A window and a chimney had been added to the gable end to mitigate its prominence.
- There would be a gap of approximately 2 metres from the house to the highway and the existing hedgerow would be maintained and reinforced with additional planting to soften the visual impact of the development.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

Previous reference: Minute 16(i) 2017/2018

Full planning application for the demolition of an existing detached garage and construction of two storey annexe at Brentroyd, Glenlyon Drive, Keighley, BD20 6LL - 18/00123/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the applicant had submitted a Doctor's letter relating to the medical circumstances of the applicant's family member who would be residing in and cared for in the proposed annexe; this was circulated to Members. He stated that a previous application was submitted and subsequently withdrawn at the Panel's meeting on 18 October 2017 following Members' concerns that the design of the development, which included a games room, did not appear to be tailored to the needs of a disabled person and due to the close proximity of the proposed development to the boundary wall. The new application was clearer in terms of how the rooms would be used to care for the family member with rooms labelled as 'carers accommodation' and 'medicine storage' as opposed to 'rooms 1 and 2' on the previous application. He referred to the part of his report which stated there was insufficient evidence presented to demonstrate that harm in terms of the scale of the proposal and its impact on the Conservation Area was outweighed by any exceptional personal circumstances or public benefits, but stated that evidence had now been submitted in the form of the Doctor's letter relating to an elderly relative, which he circulated to the Panel. He reported that the Householder Supplementary Planning Document allowed for the specific needs of a person to be taken into account when considering household extensions and asked Members to consider what weight they would put on the evidence submitted. He stated that the previous application had lacked clarity on whether the proposal was an annexe due to its lack of interdependency on the host dwelling but that he was now satisfied that it showed a degree of subservience to the host dwelling and was capable of functioning as an annexe. He also reported that, since the previous application, the location of the proposed annexe had been moved away from the boundary wall and the roof was designed to slope away from the boundary wall. In summarising the representations received (five in objection and 10 in support), he stated that the Design and Conservation Team had objected to the proposal as they considered it would impact negatively on the street scene and conservation area due to its size and appearance. Keighley Town Council had also recommended the application for refusal on the grounds that it was too similar to the previously refused applications. The application was then recommended for refusal because its prominence would detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and in relation to the harm it would have on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in which the property was set in.

The Chair expressed her disquiet at the lack of presence at the meeting from the Design and Conservation Team given their objection to the application.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that the site was located on a corner plot and the proposed annexe would be located 290mm from the boundary wall.

Members commented that:

- The proposal would not cause any overlooking onto neighbouring properties.
- The proposal was considered to blend into the surrounding area and there were more dominant houses in the area.
- The 290mm gap was too narrow to undertake maintenance work between the proposed annexe and the boundary wall.

A Councillor in support of the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- He was making representations on behalf of a neighbouring Ward Councillor who was unable to attend the meeting.
- Previously raised issues in relation to this application had been addressed.
- Plans had been amended to ensure the annexe was subservient to the host dwelling.
- The proposal would not be visible from the road.
- The applicant was not aware that medical information had to be submitted in relation to the occupant of the proposed annexe and therefore it was submitted late.
- The officer's report stated that the proposal was not near to any neighbouring properties and would not have any significant negative impact on the occupants of neighbouring land or buildings.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

That, as provided for within the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document, the special circumstances and future needs of a member of the family provide sufficient reasons to outweigh any conflict with Policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of the Local Plan for Bradford.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(g) The Bungalow, Florist Street, Keighley Keighley East

Previous reference: Minute 27(f) 2017/2018

Full application for construction of one detached house on land at The Bungalow, Florist Street, Keighley, BD21 4EN - 18/00140/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported a correction to his report; it stated that the scale was unchanged, however, this was incorrect as the ridge height had decreased from 11.48m to 11.20m, which he did not consider to be a significant change. He stated that there was a detached bungalow on the site which was to be retained. A pumping station fronting Florist Street adjoined the site and No. 63 Florist Street was located to the east. He described the site as overgrown and reported that it was located within the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 3 as it was at a high risk of flooding and had previously been flooded.

The application had previously been submitted without a Flood Risk Assessment and subsequently withdrawn at the Panel's meeting on 10 January 2018, it was now accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which recommended that if the application was approved, the garage and basement area should be designed to allow for flooding and that the ground floor be set at 86.41m Above Ordnance Datum. He stated that the Council's Drainage Officer had raised concerns about the lack of detail about how the garage would function to allow water to flow in and out as well as details about drainage for the proposed house. Two objections had been received in relation to the height of the proposed development and concerns relating to the extra strain it would put on the pumping station. One comment in support of the proposal had also been received, stating that it would enhance the area. He reported that he was of the view that the pumping station would not be affected. The application was then recommended for refusal due to the scale of the proposed dwelling and that its poor relationship to existing dwellings was considered to be overdevelopment of the site, causing over dominance in the street scene.

In response to a Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that both of the neighbouring properties to the site (Nos. 63 and 65 Florist Street) had submitted objections, no comments had been received from Yorkshire Water, that the proposal achieved the 45 degree sight lines, therefore would not result in a loss of light to adjoining windows and the proposed development had a similar ridge height to the neighbouring house.

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

- The site had been tidied up.
- The proposal would not impact on the pumping station.
- The key issues related to the massing and scale of the proposal but the street scene was generally made up of single type house structures of a similar height and there were terraces on the right hand side of the site which had slightly higher ridges.
- The proposal had a smaller footprint in terms of height and massing than the previously approved flats in 2007.

Following a Member's question in relation to flooding and access to the site, the applicant's agent confirmed that access would be taken from the elevated part of the road.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

The submission of the Flood Risk Assessment addresses previous concerns regarding flooding. The scale of the development and its relationship with existing dwellings is acceptable and not considered to be overbearing given the variety of houses in the area and is therefore considered to comply with Policies DS1, DS3 and DS5 of the Local Plan for Bradford.

And that the application be subject to the following conditions:

- (i) **The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment, including the mitigation measures specified by the Environment Agency.**
- (ii) **Details of the design of the garage to ensure it is water compatible and allows for the flow of water in and out shall be submitted and agreed.**
- (iii) **That the driveway be made up of permeable materials.**
- (iv) **Details of existing and proposed garden levels to be agreed.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place

40. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(a) 139 Devonshire Street, Keighley Keighley Central

The installation of two externally mounted roller shutters, guides rails and shutter boxes on the North facing front elevation of the property - 16/00103/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 2 February 2018.

(b) 2 Bracken Road, Steeton Craven

The siting of a metal storage container - 16/01071/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of Enforcement Notices under delegated powers, on 27 February 2018.

(c) 3 Bingley Road, Shipley Shipley

Unauthorised fencing and gate – 16/01094/ENFUNA

On 13 February 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(d) Mother Hubbards, Bradford Road, Keighley Keighley Central

The installation of externally mounted roller shutters, guides rails and shutter boxes on the front elevation of the property - 16/00066/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 2 February 2018.

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEALS ALLOWED

(e) **81 Crownest Road, Bingley** **Bingley**

Retrospective planning for external access staircase and landing - Case No: 17/05183/HOU

(f) **Buildings At Grid Ref 399985 441712,
Long Gate Sutton-in-Craven Keighley** **Worth Valley**

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Unauthorised building - Case No: 17/00088/ENFUNA

(g) **Far End 30 Moorland Crescent Baildon** **Baildon**

Hip to gable roof extensions and three dormer windows to existing detached bungalow - Case No: 17/04685/HOU

(h) **Pine Lodge Bailey Hills Road Bingley** **Bingley**

Raised deck area with canopy roof (constructed from talalised timber) - Case No: 17/04069/HOU

APPEALS DISMISSED

(i) **1 The Drive Burley In Wharfedale Ilkley** **Wharfedale**

Construction of a new driveway and carport - Case No: 17/03565/HOU

(j) **1 Victoria Court Keighley BD21 2SE** **Keighley Central**

Retrospective planning application for new concrete roof to existing garage to form patio with boundary treatment works - Case No: 17/02909/HOU

(k) **55 Aireworth Road Keighley** **Keighley East**

Construction of single storey rear extension of the following dimensions:
Depth of proposed extension from rear wall: 6.00m
Maximum height of proposed extension: 4.00m
Height to eaves of proposed extension: 3.00m
Depth of total extension from original rear wall: 6.00m
Maximum height of total extension: 4.00m
Height to eaves of total extension: 3.00m

- Case No: 17/06112/PNH

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

Action: *Strategic Director, Place*

41. CHAIR'S CLOSING REMARKS

The Chair, on behalf of the Panel, thanked Councillor Miller for his contribution as a Member of the Panel and wished him well for the future as it was the last meeting he was due to attend.

Chair

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley).

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