

**Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel  
(Keighley and Shipley) held on Wednesday, 18  
December 2019 in Council Chamber - Keighley Town  
Hall**

Commenced 10.00 am  
Concluded 1.30 pm

**Present – Councillors**

<b>LABOUR</b>	<b>CONSERVATIVE</b>
Engel Abid Hussain Godwin	Barker K Green

Observers: Councillor Rebecca Poulsen (Minutes 34(a & d), Councillor David Mahon –  
Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Parish Council (Minutes 34 (a & d)

Apologies: Councillor Beverley Mullaney and Councillor Adrian Naylor

**Councillor Engel in the Chair**

**30. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

In the interest of transparency all Members disclosed an interest in Minute 34(d) who had been Members of the Panel when a previous application concerning Haworth Fire Station was considered. They undertook to approach the issue with an open mind and to consider all the relevant material planning issues before making a decision.

**Action: City Solicitor**

**31. MINUTES**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 October 2019 be signed as a correct record.

**32. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

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

**33. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

**34. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL**

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

**(a) 17 Main Street, Haworth, Keighley Worth Valley**

Change of Use from (A1) bric-a-brac shop to (A4) drinking establishment and replacement of shop front at 17 Main Street, Haworth – 19/03644/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that 17 Main Street occupied part of the ground floor of a 3-storey, 19th century building at the lower end of the Haworth Main Street. The whole block was once a Co-operative store that was now split into 3 separate shop units on the ground floor. The shop fronts to these separate units had been altered and now lack design consistency and period details had been lost. The premises at No 17 seemed to have remained in retail use, most recently as bric-a-brac shop, but this unit was currently vacant. No 19 Main Street was granted planning permission for change of use to a tea room earlier in 2019 and this tea room was now in operation. Four residential flats addressed as 1-4 Rochester House, occupied the floors above Nos 17 and 19. These properties had a stair access from the street which was alongside the application premises. One of the flats owned by the same landlord was on the floor above No 17. There was also a row of residential dwellings facing the premises across the cobbled Main Street. The site lay within the Haworth Conservation Area.

It was reported that the suggested permitted hours, as set out in suggested Condition 3 were 09.00 to 22.00 Monday to Saturday and 12 to 19:00 on Sundays. To safeguard amenity, no customer would be served or otherwise make use of the premises outside these hours. These hours would help to protect the amenity of nearby occupants and enable the viability of the business which would bring a vacant building back into use.

Members made the following comments:

- Who would determine the hours of operation of the business?
- Concerned about the impact on residents with this type of business; acknowledge that this end of Main Street did have a mix of shops and residential property.
- In the interest of safety of the staff had a lighting scheme been considered for the rear yard? Any lighting proposed should be facing downwards so that it does not adversely affect neighbours.
- Needed to ensure there was adequate noise insulation to the flat above.

In response to Members comments it was reported that:

- The hours of operation would be determined by the Licensing Committee who would take into account the conditions this Panel had already agreed.
- Noise insulation in relation to the flat above the property was the owners responsibility.
- Main Street already had a mix of shops and residential property.

A Ward Councillor attending the meeting and spoke on the concerns of the residents which included:

- Impact on the change from A1 use to A4 use.
- Main Street did offer a vibrant mix of refurbished shops and residential property and most people lived and worked at the premises.
- The proposal being considered would result in problems with noise and disturbance for both residents and other businesses in this quiet part of Main Street.
- There were residential properties surrounding the property who would suffer from the proposal and affect their residential amenity.
- Impact of the one hour drinking up time; hours could be extended.
- Application states clientele would be older and less likely to smoke which is not accurate.
- The proposal would detract from the area and introduce more drunken and anti-social behaviour in Main Street.
- How would the bins be managed?
- Had a fire risk assessment been undertaken?
- Main Street was a strong thriving local community which offered a range of shops.
- People had closed their shops to attend this meeting to raise their strong objections to the proposals.

The Chair of Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Parish Council attended the meeting and raised the following concerns:

- Had a bat survey been undertaken; the noise from the condenser units would disturb the bats if they were present in the property.
- Noise concern for the resident living above the flat; one of the flats had a young family living there.
- The hours of opening was a concern; closes at 9 with an hour of drinking up time; customers outside the premises would cause noise and littering.
- People would be smoking outside and leaving cigarette butts on the street.
- No comments had been made regarding a fire risk assessment; how many people were allowed into the premises.

In response to the comments raised the Senior Planning Officer reported that:

- the closing time of the premises was 10.00; no customers would be served after these hours; if the applicant wished to change the conditions he/she would have to apply for a change of hours variation; it would be up to the applicant to prove that longer hours would not be a problem; the applicant was happy with the hours proposed.
- Bins would need to be brought to the front of the premises on collection day similar to other premises in the area.
- The proposed business was located in the wider part of Main Street.
- The Fire Risk Assessment was a separate application.
- If bats were in the premises they would be in the eaves, there were no proposals to alter the roof; it was unreasonable to ask for a bat assessment when there was no direct impact on bats.

An owner of one of the business on Main Street and who also lived above her business premises attended the meeting and spoke of her objections to the proposal:

- She was speaking on behalf of residents and businesses in Haworth; a number of objectors had closed their shops to attend the meeting today and more objectors would have attended but could not attend due to a busy period for them.
- Most of the comments in support of the proposal were personal opinions; the objector's comments were based on facts.
- The proposal would exacerbate problems with anti social behaviour, drinking and littering.
- Highways Development Control stated they had no objections to the proposal but residents disagreed.
- Haworth did not need anymore drinking establishments.
- Haworth was a historical village within a conservation area.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposal would bring significant visual improvement to the property and set a standard for future enhancement to adjoining units in the same building block.

The agent for the applicant attended the meeting and spoke in support of the application, he reported that:

- Significant improvements would be made to bring back and improve a run down building on Main Street which was supported by the Design and Conservation Officer.
- The proposal would breathe life into the lower part of Main Street.
- The proposal was for an independent and high quality micro pub.
- The opening hours were inline with other establishments in the area.
- Noise management proposals had been submitted which explained how the business would operate with a view to minimising harm to neighbours.
- In terms of the noise generated from the premises the windows would be closed when the premises were busy and no depositing of glass after 6pm etc would be undertaken.
- The applicant was fully aware of his responsibilities.

- Planning officers had recommended approval; small businesses could co-exist in areas such as Haworth.
- Lighting in the rear yard could be looked at.
- Bins would remain at the back and brought to the front on collection days similar to other businesses in the area.
- Fire Safety was part of the licence.

It was reported that the A4 use was a Main Town Centre Use and was of a scale compatible with the role of the Haworth Main Street Local Centre. It would not have any adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the centre. Re-use of the premises and the replacement shop front would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Haworth Conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy EN3. Subject to the suggested conditions, the scale of the proposed use was such that it was not considered harmful to the amenity of nearby occupiers. It was therefore considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and is sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place’s technical report, with an additional condition that before the premises are brought into use for the purpose hereby permitted, details of a scheme for lighting of the rear yard shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason : In the interests of safety and to ensure lighting does not adversely affect bats.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(b) 24 Clifton Road, Ilkley**

**Ilkley**

Full planning application for the construction of a detached dwelling and integral garage on land at 24 Clifton Road, Ilkley – 19/02787/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that 24 Clifton Road was a detached stone built two storey dwelling dating from the 1960s set in a large garden plot and positioned well back from the south side of the highway. There was a mix of housing styles and ages in evidence along Clifton Road. All properties were set in generous plots with mature trees and landscaping which added to the character of the area. Due to changes in levels the property occupied a slightly elevated position relative to the highway and was set behind an established stone wall and mature planting.

The site the subject of this application comprised a sloping, lawned side garden

area to No 24. Levels rose in a southerly direction towards the rear of the plot. There was an established belt of trees and landscaping along the western boundary of the plot where it adjoined No 20 Clifton Road. Immediately to the east of the site was the garage of the existing dwelling, No 24 Clifton Road.

It was reported that the scheme had been amended since initially submitted in that the overall height of the dwelling had been reduced by about 2m to address Officer concerns about the imposing mass of the original proposal and in response to the objections.

The design of the roof had also been amended as a consequence of this - with the gable feature now set into the roof and the first floor recessed balcony removed from the plan. The size of the accommodation had also been reduced from five to four bedrooms. A section drawing had also been submitted to demonstrate how the building would sit relative to neighbouring dwellings along Clifton Road.

Members sought clarification on a number of points outlined by the Senior Planning Officer such as the roof height, the difference in height between no 24 and the new 22, whether windows in the side elevation would be obscure glass and felt that a further condition should be added which meant that the side elevation of the dwelling should be glazed using obscure glass to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to occupiers of adjacent properties.

An objector presented a diagram to the panel which she had previously submitted to the Planning Office that showed the side elevation looking east from No 20 Clifton Road.

The objectors who attended the meeting spoke of their concerns which included:

- The proposed dwelling would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring dwellings due to its height; it was 12 feet higher than normal dwellings.
- The property would be taller than the neighbours.
- The proposal did not follow the conditions imposed in an earlier grant of planning permission.
- Tree protective fencing and provision for replacement planting should be undertaken; a number of trees had already been removed by the applicant.
- The development was too high and over dominant being harmful to both visual amenity and the amenities of neighbouring dwellings; being a three storey would not be in keeping with the character of the street.
- Ceiling of the third floor should be reduced.
- There was a lack of section drawings so the full impact of the build could not be appreciated; the panel should do a site visit to see the impact and implications of the proposed dwelling.
- The property would sit too close to neighbouring dwellings and appear cramped and out of keeping with the character of the rest of the street.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that whilst properties were generally two

storeys in appearance along Clifton Road, a number incorporated three storey sections and appeared taller than neighbours. The main area for concern had been the impact of the proposed dwelling on the nearest neighbouring house at No 20 Clifton Road. It was noted that the new unit was taller than the neighbouring property however it should not appear an over dominant or overbearing structure given that it was set further back into the plot than No 20. The substantial intervening hedging line and tree belt along the joint boundary would also help to screen the dwelling, in part, from view. A condition to secure and reinforce this landscape buffer should help to maintain this feature in the long term.

It was reported that no overlooking concerns were envisaged. The siting of the dwelling accorded with the Council's normally applied minimum spacing standards in respect of facing distances and consequently properties opposite and to the rear of the site should not suffer any loss of privacy through overlooking. The two windows shown in the side elevation nearest to No 20 Clifton Road were small secondary windows to a bedroom and first floor lounge and the drawings showed these to be fitted with obscure glass.

The agent for the applicant attended the meeting and spoke in support of the application, he reported that:

- The construction of a 2.5 storey 4 bed dwelling was approved in 2016.
- The overall height of the dwelling had been reduced by about 2 metres.
- The recessed balcony had been removed from the plan.
- The new property would be in line with the host property.
- The position of the property would aid screening.
- First floor gable windows would be obscured glass.
- In negotiations with Yorkshire Water in terms of the siting of the drains.
- The applicant had gone to some length to satisfy residents and planning concerns.

In response to a Member's concern relating to the impact on the local sewer system it was reported that Yorkshire Water had now withdrawn their objections to the development as it was considered that the construction of the proposed dwelling would not compromise the structural integrity of the sewers taking into account the topography of the site and the depths of the sewers.

Members stressed that an additional condition should be added in relation to planting/landscaping on the West boundary of the plot.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposed development would result in the creation of an additional dwelling in an established residential area which would add to the variety of the local housing stock without having an adverse impact on either highway safety, local services or the amenities of neighbouring residents. Outline planning permission had been previously granted on the site for a 2½ -storey dwelling on the site and there had been no material changes in circumstances to warrant the Local Planning Authority coming to an alternative view. The proposal was considered to accord with Policies DS1, DS3, DS4, DS5, HO5, H06, HO9, SC9 and TR2 of the Council's adopted 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 with the following additional conditions;**

- (i) That the windows at 1st floor level in the side elevation of the dwelling hereby approved shall be glazed using obscure glass. Thereafter, these windows shall be retained with obscure glazing.**

**Reason: To prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to occupiers of adjacent properties.**

- (ii) That before the dwelling is brought into use additional planting/landscaping shall be carried out on the west boundary of the plot in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason: In the interests of amenity and privacy.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(c) Dove Hall, Green Lane, Baildon**

**Baildon**

Change of use of an annex to a holiday let (retrospective) at Dove Hall, Green Lane, Baildon – 18/03272/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that Dove Hall was part of a group of buildings standing in open countryside to the west of Baildon on the south side of Green Lane. The lane was narrow and had no separate footways but had a good tarmac surface. It was recorded as Public Bridleway No. 59 (Baildon). The site stood on an elevated hillside from which the property enjoyed views south across the Aire Valley. Green Lane also served Hope Farm, a livery stable further to the west.

This planning application concerned the use of a free-standing single storey building to the west side of Dove Hall. It was originally used for stables and as a garage but was converted into habitable accommodation following a planning permission granted in 2016 which referred to “conversion of existing garage/stable to an annex”. Instead of being used as ancillary accommodation, the building had been used as a holiday let since around April 2018.

In response to a Members question it was reported that there had been no reports of accidents on this road.

The agent for the applicant attended the meeting and spoke in support of the



application he reported that:

- The Council encouraged tourism to the district; the lettings use brought in visitors to the local areas who spent money in local shops.
- Holiday lets were not fully booked all year round whereas a dependent relative annex could be occupied 52 weeks a year.
- A holiday let would generate less traffic and would only generate traffic couple of times a day compared to someone living there permanently who would be coming and going a lot more.
- Most of the tourists would come to walk.
- There was no evidence to show that such a small holiday let would lead to an increase in traffic movement.

A Member commented that the application should have been submitted as a holiday let originally rather than ancillary accommodation.

It was reported that on balance, it was not accepted that there was clear evidence that the use of this existing building for holiday let purposes rather than its authorised use as a 1-bedroom dependent annex would significantly intensify the level of traffic on Green Lane or result in conditions prejudicial to highway safety. Although its role as a bridleway was appreciated, there was similarly no evidence that scale of traffic movements associated with such a modest holiday let would severely affect the use of Green Lane as a local route for walking and riding. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with the requirements of Policies DS4 and DS5 of the Bradford Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document which sought to promote safe and inclusive streets and places.

**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) Haworth Fire Station, Station Road, Haworth Worth Valley**

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

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He provided an appraisal of the application and informed Members that the site was a flat, roughly triangular parcel of land located at the corner of Station Road and Bridgehouse Lane; this junction was now controlled by a mini roundabout. The site was occupied by the single storey disused fire station. It abuts the railway station yard and was between the two defined local centres in Haworth (Main Street and Mill Hey). It was noted that there was a similar convenience store built in around 1990, opposite the railway yard, within a short distance of the site. There was a mix of land used in the vicinity with housing predominating directly opposite.

It was noted that Highways Development Control felt that the amended plans alleviated the Highway Engineer's previous concerns and if approval was recommended then conditions were suggested; the Council's Conservation Officer had stated that the site was adjacent to but not within the Haworth Conservation Area, it was assessed as impacting upon views of, and standing in proximity to the Grade II listed Bridgehouse Mills; the applicant's Planning & Retail & Heritage Statement properly and comprehensively identified all heritage assets which might be affected by the proposals; the Historic Environment Record for West Yorkshire had been consulted on-line, and there was no content specifically for the application site; it was noted that the external appearance of the proposed structure had been amended since it was first submitted, the resulting design was considered to present a pleasing contemporary appearance.

Members were informed that an additional objection had been received from Transport Consultants who reiterate previous highway objections submitted in 2018 which included visibility splays being insufficient.

It was reported that the Highway Officer had considered the additional objection and had not raised any concerns.

Members sought clarification on the information presented which included possibility of an electric vehicle charging point and possibility of a controlled pedestrian crossing rather than a zebra crossing.

A Ward Councillor attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the proposal, she reported that:

- The proposal would have highway safety implications; there were inadequate parking and pedestrian crossing near to the roundabout.
- This particular roundabout currently caused a lot of problems.
- Outcome of the road safety audit for the roundabout was still outstanding.
- The pedestrian access proposed was not safe.
- The area already had a convenience store.
- Motorists would be parking on yellow lines and causing traffic issues.
- The opening hours could attract anti-social behaviour and disturbance to surrounding residents.
- The proposed illuminating totem sign was out of keeping for the area.

In response to the comments raised it was reported that:

- The totem sign was a separate advertisement.
- The road safety audit was outstanding and the applicant of Bridgehouse Mills needed to have that undertaken and was not for this application.
- The current proposal offered a safe crossing and a shorter route to the establishment.
- Confident that the stopping distance approaching the roundabout was more than the minimum stopping distance required.

Members sought further clarification from officers in relation to the most appropriate type and location for the pedestrian crossing.

The Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Parish Councillor attended the meeting and stated that the Parish Council agreed in principle to the application but asked whether other options had been considered such as the suitability of the location and the type of crossing proposed; had a traffic island been considered; the totem sign was not appropriate.

An objector attended the meeting and stated that the recent high court decision quashed the planning decision; the letter of this meeting was only received on Friday; the issues such as highway concerns had already been raised; heritage points had been made; visibility splays were not appropriate, peer review undertaken by Vector; visibility splays had not been shown properly on the documents which contained inaccuracies; the access to the store was dangerous and impacted on highway safety.

In response to the objections the Principal Engineer reported that improving visibility to the left would require third party land; officers were not aware of any negotiations as to whether the height of the wall could be reduced; officers had looked at the store and its access and felt it was in a suitable location; visibility at this location was better than what the Spar Convenience Store had which had less visibility and no reported accidents.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and spoke in support of the application he reported that the premises had been vacant for four years and therefore this proposal would put a disused site to a good use; the business would create 20 jobs; the co-op was an ethical trader, 1% of its income would go into the local community; residents would not have to travel to other towns thus reducing car journeys to Keighley which would benefit the environment; the decision was not appealed on highway grounds; the proposal included a picnic area and a viewing platform; the Spar wished to maintain monopoly position by attempting to block plans by another retailer; the proposed store offered better parking facilities than the Spar and would alleviate parking issues close to the existing retailer; the applicant had undertaken everything asked by the Highway Office such as dropped kerb, crossing etc; the design was attractive and would enhance the area; hear what was being said and the totem sign would be removed.

Members requested that additional conditions should be looked at in relation to traffic measures in order to improve the safety of the area such as a controlled pedestrian crossing.

It was reported that the investment into the redevelopment of a neglected, vacant site would improve the appearance of this prominent corner plot in the heart of Haworth and as such would enhance the area. The planning balance supported approval of the application, the proposals raised no significant issues with regards impact on local amenity, heritage, highway safety or any other planning-related matters and the proposals were acceptable when measured against the relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report subject to the amendment to Condition 8 as follows:**

**That before the development is brought into use the off-site highway improvements hereby approved, which include the provision of:-**

- (i) a new footway along the site frontage (Station Road and Bridgehouse Lane),**
- (ii) a pedestrian crossing on Station Road, and**
- (iii) a dropped crossing and associated measures on Bridgehouse Lane**

**and which are shown indicatively on Drawing No. 1625 PL 103 L, shall be implemented on site in accordance with a specification to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then not be brought into use until these works have been completed on site to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(e) 74 Wheatley Lane, Ilkley**

**Ilkley**

A planning application for the demolition of an existing garage and construction of a new two storey garage to house three vehicles and form a one bedroomed annexe on the first floor at 74 Wheatley Lane, Ilkley – 19/01115/HOU.

The Applicants Agent requested that the application be deferred to a future meeting.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be deferred to a future meeting at the request of the applicant.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

### **35. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

The Panel was asked to consider other matters which were set out in **Document "L"** relating to miscellaneous items:

- (a) Requests for Enforcement/Prosecution Action**
- (b-d) Decisions made by the Secretary of State – Allowed**
- (e-i) Decisions made by the Secretary of State – Dismissed**

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

- (a) **Wicken Crag, Halifax Road, Cross Roads, Worth Valley  
Keighley**

Without planning permission, engineering operations consisting of the deposit of excavated material to form an embankment – 18/00010/ENFUNA.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice on 17 October 2019. It was considered expedient to instigate Enforcement (Legal) Action.

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

### **Appeal Allowed**

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>WARD</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
(b)	Bingley Rural	4 Birkshead Mews Wilsden Bingley BD15 0FL  First floor balcony to rear - Case No: 19/01297/HOU  Appeal Ref: 19/00101/APPHOU
(c)	Shipley	81 Moorhead Lane Shipley BD18 4JW  New dormer window to east and south elevation - Case No: 19/01286/HOU  Appeal Ref: 19/00069/APPHOU
(d)	Keighley West	Beltrees Occupation Lane Keighley BD22 7LB  Construction of two wooden pre-fabricated outbuildings in the rear garden to be used in connection with a small-scale, home-based cattery business. - Case No: 19/00278/FUL  Appeal Ref: 19/00085/APPFL2

### **Appeal Dismissed**

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>WARD</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
(e)	Bingley Rural	19 Hunters Green Cullingworth Bingley BD13 5JH  Replacement porch extension - Case No: 19/01694/HOU  Appeal Ref: 19/00086/APPHOU

- (f)                    **Ilkley**                    **5 Dale View Ilkley LS29 9BP**
- Change of use from adopted highway to private curtilage - Case No: 19/01578/FUL
- Appeal Ref: 19/00104/APPFL2
- (g)                    **Shipley**                    **Advertising Right On Gable Old House At Home 75 Otley Road Shipley West Yorkshire**
- Replacement of existing advertising display with a digital advertising display with illuminated static images on a 10 second sequential rotation, illumination adjusting to ambient light levels - Case No: 19/02380/ADV
- Appeal Ref: 19/00108/APPAD2
- (h)                    **Worth Valley**                    **Land Adjacent To 81 Hebden Road Haworth Keighley West Yorkshire**
- Construction of detached dwelling with parking - Case No: 19/01340/FUL
- Appeal Ref: 19/00100/APPFL2
- (i)                    **Worth Valley**                    **Lower Mill Hill Farm Butt Lane Haworth Keighley West Yorkshire BD22 8QJ**
- Two storey extension to the rear and first storey extension to Butt Lane. - Case No: 19/01177/HOU
- Appeal Ref: 19/00075/APPHOU

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