

## Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 27 March 2019 in the Council Chamber - Keighley Town Hall

Commenced 10.00 am  
Concluded 12.45 pm

### Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE
Lee Abid Hussain Godwin Mullaney	Rickard Riaz

Observers: Councillor Rebecca Poulsen (Minute 46 (a)), Councillor Malcolm Slater (Minute 46 (f)) and Councillor Martin Smith (Minute 46 (c))

Apologies: Councillor Adrian Naylor

### Councillor Lee in the Chair

#### 43. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Rickard disclosed an interest in relation to 17 Victoria Avenue, Ilkley (Minute 46(c)) as he was a member of Ilkley Town Council and had taken part in a meeting when it had considered the planning application. He therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of the item 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).

**Action: City Solicitor**

#### 44. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

#### 45. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

#### 46. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

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

**(a) Haworth Fire Station, Station Road, Worth Valley  
Haworth, Keighley**

Previous reference: Minute 41(b) (2018-2019)

Full planning application for demolition of existing building and construction of A1 food retail unit with parking and associated works and ATM machine at Haworth Fire Station, Station Road, Haworth - 18/02585/FUL

The Chair reminded Members that the application had been deferred at the Panel’s previous meeting on 27 February 2019 as the applicant had stated that the site plan being considered was not the correct version. She informed the Panel that it had since been clarified that the Panel were considering the correct plan but, as there were two Panel Members in attendance who had not been present at the last meeting, the full presentation would be provided again by the Strategic Director, Place.

The Strategic Director, Place provided an appraisal of the application, as previously given at the Panel’s meeting on 27 February 2019. This again covered the main planning issues in respect of the principal of retail development and its position outside two Haworth Local Centres; the building design and the impact of development on heritage assets; and the highway safety implications.

In addition he reported on and tabled a plan (Revision L) which had been submitted by the applicant and which provided further clarification of the existing highway layout. He also reported on the receipt of an additional objection since the previous meeting but stated that it did not raise any new issues than those already outlined in his report. Members were informed of representations received in support and in objection to the application, including those received from representatives on behalf of the Spar convenience store, located on Station Road. With regard to highway implications he also stated that the site was on the junction of Bridgehouse Lane and Station Road which had recently been reconfigured to include a mini roundabout. He reported that the applicant had submitted additional highway drawings which would be negotiated with the highways department in relation to ensuring the highway works would be built to the correct specifications. The plans also demonstrated how a 10.35 metre rigid delivery vehicle would be able to access and egress the site in forward gear and this was considered satisfactory for deliveries to the proposed store. The size of the delivery vehicles would be limited to 10.35 metres as per Condition 8. He then recommended the application for approval.

In response to Members’ questions, the Strategic Director, Place stated that:

- The nearest trees were set back and remote from the site and would therefore be retained during building works.
- The site was on the approach to a conservation area but was not inside it.

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

- She had received a lot of comments locally; some people welcomed a new convenience store whilst others raised concerns about having two convenience stores on the same stretch of road.
- Some residents would prefer the store in a different location.
- She was not objecting fully to the plans as a Ward Councillor but had some concerns in relation to highway safety and pedestrian access.
- The site was next to a new mini roundabout where she considered there were already major highway concerns.
- The mini roundabout was misused as many drivers did not drive around the roundabout or give way.
- A highway safety audit was awaited in relation to the mini roundabout.
- She had received numerous highway concerns from residents of the village.
- There would not be enough visibility for drivers to see pedestrians using the proposed crossing near the mini roundabout.
- There was no pavement on one side of Bridgehouse Lane.
- She raised safety concerns that people approaching the store on foot would walk along the road rather than cross over Bridgehouse Lane to use the footpath on the other side and cross back over again; this would cause severe danger to pedestrians.
- The nearby Spar store had a car park but people often chose to park on the road for convenience and she raised concerns that if this was also the case for the proposed Co-op store, it would be more dangerous given its close proximity to the mini roundabout.
- She welcomed the increased use of stone for the proposed building.
- She had concerns that if the proposed signage totem was illuminated it would be out of keeping with the area and detrimental to the flats, opposite the site, on Station Road.
- Her concerns related to highway safety, pedestrian access and design.

The Strategic Director, Place informed Members that signage would be addressed through a separate application. In response to highway safety concerns expressed by the Ward Councillor, he stated that:

- The mini roundabout was considered to regulate speeds of most motorists and whilst some were misusing it, the overall speeds were lower.
- He did not consider that a controlled crossing was needed on Bridgehouse Lane.
- He was confident that there was enough visibility for drivers to allow them enough stopping distance on their approach to the crossing.
- He did not consider that the proposed access to the store would encourage drivers to park on the side of the road as they would then need to walk to the entrance of the car park.
- Road safety audits would be carried out in relation to the mini roundabout but they were not part of this application.

A discussion took place regarding the pedestrian access from Bridgehouse Lane and Members considered it would be better to have a pavement along the whole side of Bridgehouse Lane, closest to the site. In response, the Strategic Director, Place stated that, whilst not ideal, the proposal was to include additional

pavement where currently there was none and due to the width of the road it was not possible to include a whole stretch of pavement along one side of the lane.

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

- He was representing the Spar convenience store.
- On behalf of his organisation (PSA Design) he had previously submitted two letters outlining concerns about the potential highways and transport implications of the proposals and had not received a response to those concerns from the local planning authority or applicant.
- The application should be refused on highway safety grounds.
- There was no evidence to prove that the visibility sightlines could be achieved.
- Delivery vehicles would need to carry out a five point turn and drive across the pedestrian route to the store in order to access the service area.
- A 10 metre rigid delivery vehicle would need to use the whole of the carriageway on Station Road when entering and leaving the site.
- The applicant had not demonstrated how the proposal would be able to accommodate refuse vehicles which were generally longer than 10.35 metres.
- Articulated vehicles which were owned by the Co-op were longer than 10.35 metres.
- If 16.5 metre long vehicles could not access the site this could lead to on-street servicing.
- The application should be refused on the basis that it did not demonstrate adequate sightlines.

The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that in his opinion adequate visibility splays could be achieved and that Members could include an additional condition in relation to this if they wished. He also informed Members that some convenience stores tended to take away their own refuse but he was unaware about the refuse disposal arrangements for Co-op stores. He considered the issue of refuse collection to be one which could be controllable by the store manager i.e. arranging set times and assisting in safety measures. He considered the issue of service vehicles using the whole width of Station Road on their arrival/exit to be acceptable given the low frequency of their visits. He therefore did not consider the issue of refuse collection to be a problem.

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

- He apologised for mistakenly stating that the Panel were considering the wrong plan at the previous meeting.
- The proposal would see a Co-op store on a currently redundant site.
- The proposal would allow for a greater choice of food supply in the area and would create 20 jobs.
- The Co-op was an ethical trader which gave back to charitable schemes.
- Keighley and Worth Valley Railway supported the application and did not wish to see a residential development on the site.
- The site would be kept clean, tidy and litter free.
- There had been 34 representations in support of the application and only 13 objections.
- All service vehicles accessing the site would do so in forward gear and this would be subject to a condition as stated in the report.

- The Co-op stores took away their own waste therefore the point raised by the objector in relation to access for larger refuse vehicles was irrelevant.
- A crossing was proposed on Station Road and an informal crossing was proposed on Bridgehouse Lane.
- At present, pedestrians crossed Bridgehouse Lane without a crossing in place.
- The proposal would include 19 car parking spaces whereas the Spar on Station Road only had 11.
- He considered it hypocritical that the Spar store had raised objections in relation to the servicing of the proposed store as it carried out its own from the road side.
- The Co-op would provide more choice and was in line with council policy.
- The officer's report stated that the proposal raised no significant issues with regards impact on local amenity or highway safety.

Members made the following comments:

- The proposal would be beneficial for the local community; it would create 20 jobs and complied with council policy.
- Competition with other convenience stores in the area was considered healthy.
- A lot of discussion had taken place with regards to highway issues but it was considered that these had been mitigated.

**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) 15 Wentworth Close, Menston,  
Ilkley**

**Wharfedale**

Householder application for the retention of a flat roofed, single storey extension to the rear and the addition of a proposed two storey extension to the side of 15 Wentworth Close, Menston, Ilkley - 18/05434/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed the Panel that the property was a detached two-storey bungalow and there were two aspects to the application: the retention of an existing flat roofed, single storey extension to the rear of the property; and a proposed two storey extension to the side of the property. He described the site and surrounding area and explained that the applicant had stated that the timber clad single storey extension to the rear of the bungalow had been constructed following advice from the Council in which she had been advised that it could be built as permitted development. However, upon further investigation it was decided that because the extension was not built in "similar materials" to the original dwelling house, it did not meet one of the conditions (A3) for permitted development set down in the planning legislation. He provided a summary of the issues raised by the seven objections received against the

proposals which related to the design, materials, effects on the character of the area and impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours. He stated that whilst Menston Parish Council neither objected nor supported the application, it had raised concerns regarding the window at the rear of the property and the proposal to render the house, as the rest of Wentworth Close was built in brick. The cladding on the rear extension was Siberian larch and although of contemporary design, the Strategic Director, Place considered it to be acceptable considering its local context. He outlined details for the proposed two storey extension and stated that he did not consider that it would have a harmful effect on the amenity of occupiers of adjoining residential properties. He stated that his only area of concern had been a side window installed in the rear extension which looked onto the garden of the adjoining house at 11 Wentworth Close and he therefore proposed a condition for the implementation of obscure glazing or a two metre screen fence. He then recommended the application for approval.

An objector was present at the meeting. Pre-submitted photographs were tabled and he made the following points:

- He was a neighbouring resident.
- The proposed development would feel oppressive due to its size and close proximity to his property.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and would not be pleasing to the eye.
- The design and materials were out of keeping with the existing style of property.
- He was concerned the proposal would stand out in a bad way.

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

- His objection had included an invitation to view the site from his home.
- Officers had not been to see the site from the viewpoint of his home.
- Prior to the flat roofed, single storey extension being constructed he had emailed the applicant with regards to the wrong materials proposed to be used and sent a further email asking her to consider using frosted glass for the side window, but she had not.
- When the extension had been constructed with the use of the cladding material he had alerted the local planning authority to inform them.

In response to comments made by the objector, the Strategic Director, Place stated that when he had visited the applicant's property he had immediately seen there was an issue with regards to overlooking onto the neighbouring property due to the side window and therefore did not find it necessary to take a view from the objector's property; and that once the objector had notified the local planning authority, the issue was taken up by an enforcement officer.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place reported that the proposal would leave a 0.9 metre gap to the side boundary between the applicant's property and the neighbouring property.

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

- She had sought advice from the local planning authority prior to the construction of the rear single storey extension which she was told could be built under permitted development rights.
- She considered she had been misadvised.
- The original side window had been 900mm wide but had since been reduced in size.
- She was not a developer and was investing in her 1970's home.
- She had received compliments on the Siberian larch wood cladding used for the single storey rear extension.
- Many young families were moving into the Menston area and the investment she had made in her property was also an investment in the local community.
- The window gave a view of the countryside and to block this would go against her intention of having the window in the first place.
- She had invested in keeping a monkey puzzle tree which the previous owners of the property had planted as a sapling.
- Wentworth Close was a tired looking street and her investment in the property should be welcomed.

A Member commented that the investment in the 1970's property, in order to bring it up to date, should be welcomed.

**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) 17 Victoria Avenue, Ilkley**

**Ilkley**

A householder planning application to construct a carport to the side (north) of the existing detached garage and demolition of existing garden outbuilding to facilitate the works at 17 Victoria Avenue, Ilkley -18/04200/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed the Panel that the site was located within the Ilkley Conservation Area and that trees protected by tree preservation orders also existed within the site, close to the existing large detached garage. He stated that 23 objections had been received against the proposal including one from a Ward Councillor referring the application to the Panel for determination. He provided a summary of the representations received. He reported on an additional representation in objection to the proposal which had been received from another Ward Councillor after his report had been written. With permission from the Chair he read out a letter from the Ward Councillor as she was unable to attend the meeting. It stated that the area of land was a public highway, not a public footpath and objected to the loss of a protected tree. He informed Members that the proposed carport was for a classic vintage vehicle in the applicant's ownership. Members were informed that the views of the carport would be limited and the main issue was the impact on two protected trees. The Council's Tree Officer had raised concerns due to the lack of details in relation to

the trees but accepted that the application could work in theory; a detailed engineering report would need to be submitted to the Council for approval, as stated in proposed condition 3. In order to facilitate the proposed development a large pine tree (T1) would need to be removed. This particular tree was located amongst a group of trees and there were concerns that its removal would leave a second large pine tree in the group (T2) being exposed. The planting of six new pine trees, on land just outside the residential curtilage but within the ownership of the applicant, had been agreed to mitigate against the loss of the tree (T1). He concluded that the carport could be accommodated on the site without significant harm to the trees and subsequently upon the wider character and amenity of the area. He considered the development acceptable and then recommended it for approval.

An objector was present at the meeting. Pre-submitted photographs were tabled and he made the following points:

- This was the third application which the applicant had submitted for a carport within the last 18 months.
- The proposal would result in the loss of two protected trees.
- Although the proposal stated that only one protected tree (T1) would be lost, the loss of another protected tree (T2) was inevitable and this also the view of her tree expert.
- The carport could be constructed in another area which was an eco-friendly alternative.
- The photographs tabled showed the significant contribution which the trees (T1 and T2) made to the area.
- The trees should not be lost in order to provide shelter for one classic car.
- The local planning authority was unequivocal in refusing the first application made by the applicant for a carport.
- She considered that the application did not accord with policy EN5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- Her tree expert had stated that the replacement saplings would struggle to grow.
- Her local MP had written in support of the objectors.
- A photograph showed that the woodland trees had already been damaged by the passage of heavy machinery and this proposal could cause further damage.
- The applicant's own tree expert had stated that there could be some damage to tree roots caused by the proposal.
- The tree officer had stated there would be no arboricultural concerns if the carport was proposed on the other side of the applicant's house as such a scheme would not cause any loss of trees or amenity.
- She urged the Panel to refuse the application due to the proposed loss of healthy trees and the eco-friendly alternative available to the applicant.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place explained that whilst the proposal would see the loss of one tree (T1), there were concerns that it would also affect another pine tree (T2) and leave its roots over exposed. For this reason, a replacement tree planting scheme was proposed.

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

- The removal of underplanting in the woodlands on the site had caused flooding on the un-adopted highway.
- The proposal was likely to cause the loss of two protected trees.
- There was an alternative available which would not cause damage to the trees or woodlands.
- It would take 60 years for any replacement trees planted to reach the size of the pine trees that would be lost.
- He considered that the application did not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

- The site was located within the Ilkley Conservation Area and required careful consideration in order to maintain the area.
- He had recently visited the site and had seen six tree stumps; he believed the trees had been removed without authority.
- Un-authorised works along the boundary of the site had been on-going for the last 18 months but there had been no new planting in the area.
- The site of the proposed carport could be re-located.
- He considered that other separate buildings contributed to the area but a carport would not.
- Ilkley Town Council recommended that the application be refused.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Place stated that he was aware that one cherry laurel tree had been removed from the site but it had not been protected and therefore did not require permission to be sought prior to its removal.

Members expressed reservations about the location of the proposal and considered that it could be better placed on the other side of the applicant's residential property. They also raised concerns about the impact the proposal would have on protected trees (T1 and T2) and the viability of other trees within the woodlands which could alter water courses.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be refused for the following reason:**

**The proposed location of the carport would cause loss of protected pine tree T1 and threaten the viability of protected pine tree T2. The proposed replanting scheme is not considered to adequately mitigate the effects on the natural environment caused by loss of these protected trees from the Ilkley conservation area. The design of the proposed carport is also not considered in keeping with the conservation area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies EN3 and EN5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.**

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(d) Black Bull Inn, 119 Main Street,  
Haworth Keighley**

**Worth Valley**

Full (retrospective) planning application for the installation of two pole mounted number plate recognition cameras in the rear car park of the Black Bull Inn, 119 Main Street, Haworth, Keighley - 19/00015/FUL

**Resolved –**

**That the withdrawal of the application by the applicant prior to the meeting be noted.**

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(e) Fairfax Club, 15 Main Street, Menston,  
Ilkley**

**Wharfedale**

Full application for demolition of an existing social club and construction of 3 detached residential dwellings and a replacement social club building (including car parking) at the Fairfax Club, 15 Main Street, Menston, Ilkley - 18/04430/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed the Panel that the site was not within a conservation area but the boundary to the nearby Grade II listed Fairfax Hall was also the boundary of the Menston Conservation Area. He provided a description of the site and proposals as outlined in his report. Members were provided with a summary of the key issues. The application had received six objections and 30 representations in support. Two Ward Councillors had referred the application to the Panel for consideration due to the heritage issues; they had requested that the Panel give due consideration to the concerns submitted by Historic England and the Council's Conservation Team. Historic England had considered the proposals would cause some minor harm to the setting and significance of Fairfax Hall and the Council's Conservation Team also considered that the proposed development would cause harm to the setting of Fairfax Hall, due to the positioning of the proposed clubhouse which could be addressed by the repositioning of the clubhouse and its parking. He reported that, since his report had been written, Historic England had made further representation which stated that, following amended plans which showed that 'house two' would be less visible from Fairfax Hall, the harm was considered very minor and therefore they did not object to the application. He corrected an error in his report; all extraction and cooling vents, air conditioning and condensers would be placed on the east side of the clubhouse, (not the west side as stated in the report). He stated that the club did not intend to change its current hours of operation and that a condition was also proposed to this effect due to the club's close proximity to residential properties. He then recommended the application for approval.

In response to a Member's question, it was reported that the proposed smoking shelter would include open outdoor space covered by a roof and that it would be located alongside the access road.

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

- High density development on the site should be encouraged.
- Support should be given to develop housing on the underutilised brownfield land.
- The setting of Fairfax Hall had been a material consideration.
- The proposal provided sufficient public benefit and therefore accorded with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The proposal would provide an improved social club and remove a poorly surfaced car park.
- Softly landscaped gardens of the new houses would improve the drainage locally.
- Issues pertaining to residential amenity and car parking had been addressed and there were no outstanding objections from statutory consultees.
- The proposal accorded with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

**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) 4 Grange Road, Riddlesden, Keighley Keighley East**

Householder application for construction of a single storey extension to the rear of 4 Grange Road, Keighley - 19/00245/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed the Panel that the main issue was the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupier as the proposed extension would project out four metres from the back wall of the semi-detached house. There were no issues identified with the design of the proposal. He explained that, under permitted development rights, the applicant would not need to apply for planning permission if the proposed extension had been a maximum projection of three metres. He informed Members that two previous applications under the Larger Home Extensions scheme had been refused due to the impact the proposals would have in terms of overshadowing and loss of outlook on the amenity of occupiers of the neighbouring property at 2 Grange Road. The application had received one objection from the neighbouring resident and one letter of support from a Ward Councillor. The neighbouring resident had stated that whilst he would not object to a three metre extension, the proposed four metre extension would cause him significant loss of light to the rear of his property and rear garden. The Ward Councillor’s supporting letter stated that the extension was needed to increase the living space for a large family occupying the property. Due to the impact the four metre proposed extension would have on the occupiers of the neighbouring property, he considered the application did not accord with the Council’s adopted Householder Supplementary Planning Document or policies DS3 and DS5 from the Core Strategy Development Plan Document. He then recommended the application be refusal due to the significant harm that a four metre extension would cause on the amenity of the

adjoining neighbouring property.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting. Pre-submitted photographs were tabled and he made the following points:

- He was making representations on behalf of another Ward Councillor who was unable to attend the meeting.
- The photographs showed a similar four metre extension at 6 Grange Road and another in the process of being constructed at 10 Grange Road.
- The applicant was a hard working single mother with caring responsibilities for her 86 year old mother, who resided in a care home.
- The extension would help to suitably accommodate a large family.
- The kitchen was currently unsuitable for family life.
- When the applicant's mother visited the family home she could only stay for a short period as she was unable to get up the stairs to access the bathroom.
- The proposal included a downstairs toilet and this would allow the applicant's mother to visit for longer periods.
- The applicant had a health condition which made it difficult for her to walk up the stairs; downstairs toilet facilities would assist her greatly.
- He urged the Panel to consider the applicant's health and her right to family life.
- A photograph of the applicant's kitchen window showed there was very low sunlight reaching that area at present and therefore the loss of light to the neighbouring property would be minimal.

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

- A four metre extension was for necessity, not luxury.
- She had a family of six living in the three bedroom property and there was a possibility of two other family members moving in.
- Her builder had advised that the extension needed to be three or four metres and could not be in between these distances in order to avoid costs relating to gas pipes and drainage issues.
- Following the advice of her builder she had decided to apply for a four metre extension as it would not be worth her money to only have a three metre extension.
- She had consulted her adjoining neighbour who had stated that they would object to any proposal which was put forward to extend the property.
- She used her inside lighting all of the time due to the lack of natural light coming into the property.
- The proposal for a downstairs toilet would also reduce the amount of living space.
- No. 10 Grange Road had the same size of extension as the one she was proposing.

The Strategic Director, Place informed Members that the extension at No. 6 Grange Road had been constructed in 1976, prior to the Council's adoption of the Householder Supplementary Planning Document, and the extension which was currently being constructed at No. 10 Grange Road had been approved under the Larger Home Extensions scheme as no objections had been received against that proposal. He also stated that the plans submitted by the applicant did not show a

proposed downstairs toilet, only a kitchen/dining room.

A discussion took place during which Members queried whether a staggered extension could be a better way forward for the applicant as it would not block out as much light to the neighbouring property. In response, the Strategic Director, Place stated that, given the information presented by the applicant in relation to pipework issues at the back of the property, he was unsure whether a staggered extension would work. He also stated that officers had already discussed alternative solutions with the applicant and if the scheme was to be re-designed the application would need to be withdrawn, amended and re-submitted by the applicant. The Panel were reminded that it could only consider the submitted plans.

In response to a question from the Chair, the applicant stated that she did not wish to withdraw the application.

While one Member stated that he was very sympathetic to the applicant's circumstances and reasons as to why the family needed the extension to their home, other Members, although sympathetic to the applicant's reasons for the proposal, considered alternative solutions could be sought, which would not have such an adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbour.

**Resolved –**

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

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

#### 47. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

##### **REQUEST FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION**

The Strategic Director, Place presented **Document "P"** and the Panel noted the following:

- (a) **Land At White Windows Farm, Black Edge Lane, Bingley Rural Denholme**

Unauthorised use of land as a residential caravan site where the caravan is occupied as a dwelling and breach of condition 2 of planning permission reference 17/03379/FUL - 16/00814/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 19 February 2019.

**(b) 85 Moss Carr Road, Long Lee, Keighley** **Keighley East**

Without planning permission, the siting of a trailer with an outbuilding on top to the front (south) of the property - 18/00375/ENFUNA

On 19 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice. It is considered expedient to instigate Enforcement (Legal) Action.

## **DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

### ***APPEALS ALLOWED***

**(c) 1 Stone Court, East Morton, Keighley** **Keighley East**

Timber fencing fronting Morton Lane/Stone Court (retrospective) - Case No: 18/01390/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00104/APPHOU

**(d) 14 Dorchester Crescent, Baildon** **Baildon**

Construction of garage to side - Case No: 18/04326/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00154/APPHOU

### ***APPEALS DISMISSED***

**(e) 44 Hoyle Court Avenue, Baildon** **Baildon**

Two storey extension to rear - Case No: 18/01962/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00105/APPHOU

**(f) Land At Former Garage Site, Ilkley Road, Addingham** **Craven**

Residential development consisting of 8 dwellings and associated works. - Case No: 17/05708/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00055/APPFL2

**(g) West View, Upper Town, Oxenhope, Keighley**

**Worth Valley**

Ground floor extension - Case No: 18/03311/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00131/APPHOU

**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