

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 31 October 2018 in the Council Chamber - Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 10.00 am
Concluded 12.15 pm

Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	THE INDEPENDENTS
Lee Abid Hussain Godwin Mullaney	Rickard Riaz	Naylor

Observer: Councillor Chris Herd (Worth Valley) (Minute 28(e))

Councillor Lee in the Chair

24. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Rickard disclosed an interest in relation to 25 Dale View, Ilkley and Sirius, Langbar Road, Ilkley (Minute 28(b) and (g)) as he had chaired a meeting of the Ilkley Town Council when it had considered both planning applications. He therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of both items in accordance with the requirements of the Members' Code of Conduct (Part 4A of the Constitution) and the Members' Planning Code of Conduct (Part 4B of the Constitution).

Councillor Abid Hussain disclosed, in the interest of clarity, that there was an application pertaining to his ward (Keighley Central), but he had not discussed any of the matters relating to that application with any interested parties.

Carole Barrott (the City Solicitor's representative) disclosed, in the interest of clarity, that she lived opposite 29 New Close Road, Shipley (Minute 28 (c)). She stated that she knew the objectors and was aware of the applicant and that any legal advice she was asked to provide to the Panel would remain impartial.

Action: City Solicitor

25. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meetings held on 29 August and 26 September 2018 be signed as a correct record.

26. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

27. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

28. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

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

(a) 1 Margerison Crescent, Ilkley Ilkley

Householder application for construction of a replacement rear single-storey extension, and decked area to the side 1 Margerison Crescent, Ilkley - 18/02143/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application had been referred to the Panel by a Ward Councillor who had objected to the application and that three other objections had been received. He explained that some objections had been received concerning works which did not require planning permission and informed Members that the application was being considered only on the basis of the construction of a single storey extension to the rear of the house, which would replace and enlarge the existing extension approved in 1998, and the formation of a raised platform or patio on the site of the existing conservatory at the north west side of the house. He stated that, at present, the existing extension projected 2.25 metres from the back wall of the original house and the application proposed to enlarge this extension so that it projected 5 metres. In relation to the proposed raised platform, he considered it would have no greater effects on the privacy of neighbours than the existing conservatory. He considered the application to be acceptable with regard to the impact on daylight and overlooking onto neighbouring properties and recommended that it be approved.

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) 25 Dale View, Ilkley

Ilkley

Householder application for a loft conversion incorporating front dormer window extensions and rooflights, rear rooflights and conversion of a flat roof to a pitched roof over the existing ground floor living room and entrance hall at 25 Dale View, Ilkley - 18/02804/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the property was a 1970's two-storey detached house with a flat roof situated in an estate of similar suburban style properties. The application had received seven representations in objection which included one from a Ward Councillor. Comments from neighbours had been received regarding confusion over the plans, specifically regarding fence heights and chimney details which had since been clarified by the submission of amended drawings which showed appropriate height boundary treatments and had confirmed the retention of the chimney. One additional objection from a neighbour and one from the Ward Councillor had been received in response to the amended plans. The main concerns raised related to overlooking from the proposed dormer windows and with regard to them being out of character with the surrounding area. He stated that the dormer windows were originally proposed to be 2.2 metres wide but had since been reduced to 1.5 metres which accorded with guidance in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document and that there was an adequate separation distance of approximately 27 metres to properties across the street. He also emphasised that roof alterations were permitted development and did not need planning permission; the Panel were only considering planning permission for the dormer windows and conversion of a flat roof to a pitched roof. The roof tiles were described as being similar to those on 23 Dale View, which had received authorised for the addition of a similar dormer to its frontage in November 2008. He then recommended the application for approval.

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

- He and his family had lived in the property for six years.
- The fourth bedroom in the property was used as an office.
- All options had been considered to increase the space within the house.
- A side extension had been favoured as he had not wanted to increase the footprint of the property.
- The dormer windows would increase the loft space.
- The dormer windows would give a more balanced appearance and would have very little impact on the properties across the street.
- Replacing the flat roof with a pitched roof would be more energy efficient and would be better for the environment.
- The proposal was a small development to meet the needs of a growing family.
- He had amended the plans to take account of concerns initially raised.

A Member commented that she considered the appearance of the property would be improved with a pitched roof.

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) 29 New Close Road, Shipley

Shipley

Householder application seeking retrospective planning permission for construction of a garden wall and gate to the front of 29 New Close Road, Shipley - 18/03501/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the property was a modern detached house situated towards the top of a residential cul-de-sac. The application had been submitted following complaints by neighbours and an investigation by the Council's Enforcement section. Planning permission was found to be required for the gate and wall as they exceeded a height of 1 metre above ground level. He explained that, where they adjoin a highway used by vehicular traffic, walls, fences and gates could be installed as permitted development subject to a limitation that they must be less than 1 metre high. The application had received 11 representations in objection which included one from a Ward Councillor. Objectors had stated that the wall and gate were inappropriate to the character of the street and caused visual harm. Due to the sloping nature of the plot, the height of the wall varied as it stepped up the slope and it marginally exceeded the permitted development limitation of 1 metre. Four decorative pillars had been added to the wall, each with a small globe light attached. The height of the gate also varied, measuring 0.8 metre at its lowest point and 1.9 metres at its highest point. The gates were made of fabricated metal, painted black with a decorative lattice type design. Due to the design, views through the gates were afforded which minimised the loss of openness. The wall only marginally exceeded permitted development limits. Although comments of neighbours were acknowledged, it was not accepted that the new boundary wall and the accompanying pillars and lights were either dominant or had any appreciable or harmful effect on the character of the cul-de-sac. Whilst neighbours had criticised the contemporary appearance of the gate, he did not consider it to be an especially dominant or imposing means of enclosure; it was a means of securing cars parked on the frontage to which some weight needed to be given. He also alluded to Policy DS3 within the Core Strategy which stated that innovative and contemporary approaches to design which responded to and complemented the local context would be supported. He considered that neither the wall nor the gate was significantly harmful to the appearance or setting of the house or the adjoining houses and the gate was an innovative design which, though unusual, did not cause harm to the local context or character. Whilst some objections had made reference to the removal of trees from the site, he clarified that these were small garden trees which had not been protected by Tree Preservation Orders and therefore planning approval had not been required for their removal. He then recommended the application for approval.

Three objectors addressed the Panel and made the following points:

- All gates installed had to be less than 1 metre.
- The gates were 1.9 metres in height at their highest point which far exceeded 1 metre and they were too excessive.
- Visitors to the area had commented that the gates were out of keeping with the area.
- The gates were dominating due to their height.
- The officer had stated that the trees which had been removed from the garden area were small but they were approximately 25 metres in height which was not considered small. Photographic evidence was available.
- There had been a recent newspaper article about retrospective planning applications and the Panel had the opportunity to refuse an application which had not been done in the correct way.
- The issue of security was understood but the property previously had a double lockable garage which had been converted by the applicant.
- The street scene was aesthetically pleasing with an open plan nature to the cul-de-sac.
- The gates changed the overall feel of the area and could impact on the value of properties on it.
- There was a clause in the deeds for the homes on New Close Road to maintain the open aspect of the street which other residents had respected by not introducing gates.

In response to points raised by objectors, the Strategic Director, Place stated that permitted development rights allowed for the construction of a wall and gate up to 1 metre in height and that retrospective planning permission was being sought because the garden wall and gate exceeded 1 metre; the deeds clause was a private legal matter; the removal of the trees had not breached planning regulations; and the application needed to be considered on its planning merits.

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

- He was the applicant's son.
- He had purchased the house in March 2017 and moved in during February 2018, following improvement works.
- He had ascertained with planning officers that none of the trees were protected before arranging for them to be removed.
- He had been unaware that planning permission was required for the wall and gate.
- There were properties on New Close Road with gates above 1 metre and therefore he had presumed that he had not needed planning permission.
- The neighbouring properties had walls to their frontage.
- New Close Road was on a slope therefore the wall was above 1 metre on a straight line.
- Due to burglaries in the area he had wanted to take precautions by introducing the wall and gate for the safety and security of his family.
- The bespoke gates had been designed to allow in light and he considered the gates looked nice.
- The globes were for decorative purposes and had never been switched on.
- In hindsight he would have obtained planning permission if he had known it

was required.

A Member commented that the gate was a nice design and there was no issue with the removal of the trees.

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) 64 Victoria Avenue, Ilkley

Ilkley

Householder planning application for two-storey extension to rear, extension of first floor bedroom with Juliette balcony, new vehicle access to rear and new garage/garden room in the back garden of 64 Victoria Avenue, Ilkley - 18/00144/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the site was a semi-detached residential property and the proposal sought permission for extensions and alterations to the side and rear of the property and an outbuilding in the rear garden area. The application had received four representations in objection which included one from a Ward Councillor who had requested that the application be considered by the Panel. He explained that despite amended plans, as outlined in the report, being submitted by the applicant in an attempt to address some of the objections to the application, objectors had reaffirmed their concerns, which related to the removal of trees on the site, overlooking from the proposed balcony, the scale of the proposed outbuilding being considered excessive and concerns it would be used for commercial purposes, loss of light to neighbouring properties as a result of the extension and over-development of the site. He stated that the applicant intended to use the roof space as a home office and that revised drawings showed that the windows to the office space above the garage would have obscure glazing, to avoid any overlooking issues and that the use of the office would be restricted to the occupants of 64 Victoria Avenue. No separate commercial use had been sought. He provided a summary of the proposal and amended plans and stated that as the application complied with policies contained in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework, he recommended it for approval.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place stated that the trees which had been removed from the site had not been protected by Tree Preservation Orders and no planning regulations had been breached by their removal.

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

- The applicant was the new owner of the property.
- The rear garden area could only currently be accessed by going through the house.

- The proposed extension complied with the 45 degree line to the neighbours nearest window.
- Obscure glazing was proposed for the office windows to avoid any overlooking to the neighbouring property.
- The proposal would allow for vehicles to be parked to the rear of the property.
- Due to the levels of the site, the garage would be at a lower level to the house and its garden.
- The trees on the site had been removed following advice from a landscape professional who had said the quality of the trees were poor.

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) Brent Villa, Upper Town, Oxenhope, Keighley Worth Valley

Application for outline planning permission for residential development of two semi-detached dwellings with garages, parking and garden areas at Brent Villa, Upper Town, Oxenhope - 18/03279/OUT

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that there was a detached bungalow on the site and that land levels fell steeply across the site. The site was accessed from Hebden Bridge Road across a wide, open forecourt area between numbers 7-9 and 11-13 Hebden Bridge Road, opposite Oxenhope Fisheries. He explained that the application sought outline planning permission for an indicative proposal for a pair of semi-detached dwellings. The matters for consideration were access and scale with all other matters (appearance, landscaping and layout) reserved for future consideration. The application had received six representations in objection and concerns raised related to drainage, flooding, overshadowing and overlooking, highway safety and access. He referred to the site history contained in his report and stated that, if the proposal was approved, there would be five dwellings on the site. Photographs of the existing access were referred to and Members were made aware of a sharp bend further up Hebden Bridge Road from the site location and a gable end of a property in the vicinity which restricted visibility; however it was considered that the five dwellings could utilise the access point off Hebden Bridge Road without giving rise to highway safety concerns. The proposed dwellings would be of a linked detached form of two-storeys with an overall ridge height of 7.2 metres and a footprint of 8.30 metres by 5.05 metres. The scale of the dwelling was considered to reflect the scale of the adjacent and surrounding dwellings. He considered the site could accommodate further development without significantly harming the area and the indicative layout achieved acceptable separation distances. The original property at Brent Villa would still be able to maintain an acceptable level of amenity space as a consequence of the development. In relation to concerns raised regarding overshadowing and overlooking, it was considered that the new dwellings would have an acceptable relationship to surrounding neighbours. He stated that there were no records of any road traffic accidents in the area and the proposal was not

considered to cause highway safety concerns. He then recommended the application for approval.

In response to a Member's questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that there were no records of flooding on the site, no water courses on the site and details of drainage were reserved for future consideration.

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

- There was a long standing access agreement in place which did not apply to new developments.
- Visibility splays from the site to Hebden Bridge Road were restricted.
- He lived near the site location and the development would impact on his property and on the safety of the highway.
- He had had a transport report produced which had concluded that the visibility splays were below the required level.
- He considered his objection had not been properly considered by the Highways Department and that the impact on his property had been overlooked due to permission being granted to previous applications on the site.
- There was limited space on the access to the site for cars to turn into and a lack of access for waste collection and large delivery vehicles.
- The proposal would lead to over-parking on Hebden Bridge Road.
- There was no provision for opposing vehicles to pass each other on the access route.
- The application should be refused on highway safety grounds and access issues.
- Approving the application would set a dangerous precedent.
- The consultation response from Drainage stated that there was a combined public sewer in Hebden Bridge Road and foul water should be drained into this – how could this be achieved?

In response to a Member's question, the City Solicitor stated that some of the issues raised by the objector were private legal matters and the Panel were to consider the principle of the application only.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place stated that although the visibility splays were not ideal, the access was wide and level and he considered that it provided a reasonable amount of visibility. He stated that the Highways Department considered the application acceptable in terms of highway safety. The Highways officer stated that consideration had been given to the fact that the access point off Hebden Bridge Road was currently in use and the addition of two more dwellings would increase its use by three additional vehicular movements in peak traffic times daily, therefore, on balance, the proposal was not considered to be detrimental to highway safety.

The Strategic Director, Place stated that there were no water courses on the site and it was up to the applicant to satisfy the condition in relation to drainage requirements.

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

- The access to and from the proposed houses was concerning.
- When leaving the site and making a right turn from the site visibility was blocked by the gable end of a house.
- There was a sharp bend further along Hebden Bridge Road.
- Oxenhope already had a number of traffic issues.
- He urged the Panel to be mindful not to put lives in danger.
- His main concern was safety.

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

- The construction of a detached dwelling had been approved in June 2016 and had set a precedent for development on the site with two further dwellings being approved.
- The application was outline at this stage.
- The site was sloping and surface water would drain from the site.
- There would be an on-site sewage treatment.
- The proposal would contribute slightly to the housing supply in the district.
- There would be no overlooking to neighbouring properties.
- Hebden Bridge Road was part of a 20mph zone and a traffic survey showed that the average speed of traffic was less than 20mph.
- He considered the proposal would have very little impact in terms of visual amenity and highway safety.

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

(f) Land at Fife Street, Haworth, Keighley

Worth Valley

Full planning application for the construction of three terraced dwellings with parking and an access road at land at Fife Street, Haworth, Keighley - 18/03416/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the Panel had previously granted permission in January 2017 for the construction of two dwellings on the site but the applicant had now submitted plans for three. He stated that Fife Street and Dove Street, which run up either side of the application site, were surfaced with grass and provided with pavements and a small number of trees following a Housing General Improvement Area scheme in the 1980's. It would be necessary to return a part of the pedestrianised Fife Street to a vehicular highway, sufficient to serve the proposed dwellings. He considered the proposed development to be of a scale and design that would sit comfortably on the site. He stated that since the previous approval for two dwellings had been granted there had been an issue with water seeping out of the ground in the area of the proposed access road for the development therefore a pre-commencement

condition in relation to drainage was proposed to deal with potential flood risk issues. He stated that the Ward Councillor who had objected to the application had raised concerns there could be bats on the site but he had undertaken discussions with an Ecologist who had stated that if there were bats in the vicinity they would most likely be in the adjoining houses and not on the application site where there was nothing to attract them. He then recommended the application for approval.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that there was no access to the site from Dove Street.

Members commented that the proposed three terraced dwellings would sit more comfortably with the street scene than the previously approved two semi-detached houses.

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

(g) Sirius, Langbar Road, Ilkley

Ilkley

Full application for demolition of an existing single storey garden building and construction of a five bedroom detached dwelling with integral double garage and associated garden area at Sirius, Langbar Road, Ilkley - 18/02554/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout, emphasising the contemporary form and design of the proposed infill residential development. He stated that the application had received five representations in objection which included one from Ilkley Civic Society and one from a Ward Councillor who had requested that the application be referred to the Panel if recommended for approval. One comment had been received from a neighbour in support of the application and all representations were summarised. He then recommended the application for approval.

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

- The proposal had been carefully considered following consultation with officers.
- The proposal had been discussed with neighbours which had resulted in support for the application.
- The proposal would increase the housing supply within the district and make use of a redundant site.
- The proposed dwelling would be highly sustainable and far exceeded current building regulations.

In response to a Member's question, it was reported that the roof would have an incline and would not be completely flat.

A Member commended the design of the proposed dwelling.

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

(h) 122 - 124 Lawkholme Lane, Keighley

**Keighley
Central**

Change of use from shop (A1) to hot food takeaway (A5) at 122 - 124 Lawkholme Lane, Keighley - 18/03553/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application property comprised two former end terrace houses that were converted to a clothes shop in the 1990’s and the opening times had been restricted to 9.00am-5.30pm on weekdays in recognition that the property was located within a residential area. The shop was no longer operational. The application stated that it intended to open until 10.00pm which was considered unreasonable given the residential location. There was only a very narrow yard (750mm wide) which was considered to be inadequate for waste storage. He considered that a hot food takeaway in this location would have a significant detrimental effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents due to noise, vehicular activity, additional waste and general disturbance, particularly in the evening and at other unsocial hours. He cited the five reasons for refusal as outlined in his report which included that the proposal was contrary to the Council’s adopted Hot Food Take Away Supplementary Planning Document which sought to minimise the negative impacts on childhood health by controlling the proximity of new takeaways to education and recreation facilities. He stated that the application had received 41 objections and 90 representations in support, many of which were not from the local area. He then recommended the application for refusal.

In response to a Member’s questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that the proposed opening time for the takeaway business was 11.00am and whilst there were no car parking restrictions in place at the front of the site, car parking in the area for a takeaway business was undesirable.

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

- The applicant was prepared to withdraw the application and amend the plans for the bin storage.
- He was a Town Councillor for the area and supported the application.
- There were a number of commercial premises on the main road close to the site.
- The proposed opening hours had been reduced (they were originally 11.00am-11.00pm).
- The proposal was for a small family run business which would take phone

orders.

- A lot of existing similar businesses were located within 400 metres of education and recreational facilities.
- The site was within the most deprived area within the Keighley Central Ward.
- He urged the Panel to approve the application.

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

- She was representing many residents in the local area.
- Local residents did not want to live near a takeaway.
- There would be a constant smell of greasy food.
- The proposal would cause disturbance at night and many families in the area had small children.
- It would increase traffic, litter and rodents/pests.
- The bin storage facilities were inadequate.
- The location of the site was on a street corner and there was a danger that it would lead to gangs of people congregating.
- The proposed takeaway could attract children on their way home from school leading to the consumption of unhealthy fast food.
- There were a number of pupils living in the vicinity that attended University Academy Keighley.
- New takeaway businesses should not be created in the area as they were not needed.
- There were many takeaways within walking distance of the proposed location.
- Objectors had given valid reasons against the application whereas supporters had submitted general comments.
- The facts and feasibility should be considered rather than the number of supporting comments for the application.
- She was a resident who lived in the area and could vouch for car parking being an issue, especially at school start and finish times of the nearby primary school.
- Cars that parked on the main road often caused obstructions.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place stated that many of the 41 objections received had not supplied an address but, of those that had, it was evident that some were from within the Lawkholme area.

Members made the following comments:

- The property could accommodate a smaller commercial bin.
- From the photographs shown within the Strategic Director, Place's presentation, there appeared to be sufficient car parking available in the area.
- There was no need for another take away in an area where there were many within walking distance.
- The proposal would have a negative impact on the health of children in the area.
- The site was located in a residential area which was not appropriate for a takeaway.
- The photographs in the Strategic Director, Place's presentation were taken during the day but in the evening car parking space was an issue in the area.
- The site was located on a dangerous corner in terms of highway safety.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Strategic Director, Place’s technical report.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

29. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

The Strategic Director, Place presented **Document “J”** and the Panel noted the following:

(a) 71 Kirkgate, Shipley Shipley

Unauthorised fence and gate - 18/00363/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice on 2 October 2018.

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEALS ALLOWED

(b) 1, The Grove Bingley Bingley

Construction of detached dwelling - - Case No: 17/05394/OUT

Appeal Ref: 18/00038/APPFL2

(c) 2 St James Road, Ilkley Ilkley

Open front porch to front elevation of house - Case No: 18/01620/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00052/APPHOU

(d) 6 Park Road, Bingley Bingley

Change of use from derelict station house to fish and chip shop restaurant with takeaway (Use Class A3), including extension to side and rear, new windows and door, new railing to boundary and binstores - Case No: 17/06510/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00030/APPFL2

APPEALS DISMISSED

(e) 14 Pasture Avenue, Oakworth, Keighley Worth Valley

Two storey side extension - Case No: 18/00177/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00059/APPHOU

(f) 2 Ryan Grove, Keighley

Keighley West

Two storey side and single storey rear extension - Case No: 18/00992/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00042/APPHOU

(g) 4 Bingley Road, Shipley

Shipley

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 16/00716/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 18/00051/APPENF

**(h) Land East of 114 Marlborough Street,
Keighley**

Keighley Central

Replacement of an existing freestanding illuminated 48-sheet advertising display with freestanding 48-sheet digital LED display, including installation of knee rail and removal of featheredge fencing - Case No: 18/00688/ADV

Appeal Ref: 18/00061/APPAD1

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

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