

### **17/0691/OUT Trough Lane, Kelbrook**

No further information to report

### **17/0714/VAR Booths, Barrowford**

One further comment from the public commenting:

I find it irritating that Booths are prevented from this trade. Why should customers have to cross a busy main road when it would be far easier to purchase from Booths.

Booths had a similar restriction in Settle but were allowed to sell papers after public demand.

A letter has been received from the applicant as follows:

I refer to the above application which is being reconsidered at the above meeting.

I have been instructed to write on behalf of the Applicant, E. H. Booth and Co. Ltd (Booths).

Booths are disappointed about the resolution taken by members of the Barrowford and Western Parishes Committee given the material planning considerations and the recommendation by you and Kathryn Hughes to approve the application.

We note your advice to the members in the report before them on 26th about the likelihood of an award of costs against the Council on appeal.

This letter confirms that Booths are minded to exercise their right to appeal. I must also observe again that the offending part of the condition is unreasonable and there has to be a question over its legality.

Our clients hope that, upon reflection, members will grant permission as there are simply no planning grounds for refusing the application.

I would be most grateful if you could request the Chair to read this letter out to members of the committee before a decision is taken.

### **17/0773/HHO Croft Barn, Barley**

No further information to report

### **18/0003/FUL Keighley Road, Laneshawbridge**

A total of 5 comments have been made but with 3 people making more than one comment And one comment having been submitted twice. The main points of these can be summarised:

- Green belt development contrary to national and local policy.
- Would set a precedent

- Next to Ball Grove nature reserve and the development would have a detrimental impact on rare sand local wildlife.
- Would result in urban sprawl
- There is more than enough land to build on
- There has been a refusal on the site before
- The application says it is in Laneshawbridge whereas it is in fact in Colne
- The southern half is particularly attractive when viewed from below
- Concern about paths being built down
- Whilst I agree the trees are near the end of their lives there is no indication what would replace them
- The site is not within a village as the report acknowledges
- The test here is surely whether this is inappropriate development or not
- I do not agree that the site can be described as being in an anomalous location. It is outside the settlement and cannot be treated as being within