

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday 16 December 2015 at City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 1005
Concluded 1240

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
Rickard	Amran	Reid
Sykes	Ferriby	
	Lee	
	Wainwright	

Apologies: Councillor Whiteley

Observer: Councillor Thornton (Minute 23(c))

Councillor Lee in the Chair

19. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

No disclosures of interest in matters under consideration were received.

20. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meetings held on 5 August and 9 September 2015 be signed as a correct record.

ACTION: *City Solicitor*

21. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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



22. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.

23. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS

The Strategic Director, Regeneration presented **Document “I”** and **“J”**. Plans and photographs were displayed and/or tabled in respect of each application and representations summarised.

(a) **623 Harrogate Road, Bradford**

Idle & Thackley

A full planning application for the construction of one detached dwelling at 623 Harrogate Road, Bradford - 15/03837/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was for the construction of a dwelling in the garden area that would use the existing access off Harrogate Road. Members were informed that the property would ideally have benefitted from a hipped roof, however, it would have caused difficulties with the design, therefore, it was considered acceptable in the street scene. There was sufficient distance between the properties and would not create any significant adverse effects or highway safety issues. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(b) **80 - 82 Manningham Lane, Bradford**

Manningham

Change of use from A2 (offices) to A3 (restaurant/café) including installation of new shop front and extraction flue at 80-82 Manningham Lane, Bradford - 15/03785/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. Members were informed that the application requested the approval of a change of use of the ground floor from an office to a restaurant, which was acceptable in principle. It was a modern building that was mainly used for commercial purposes, however, there were some residential properties in the vicinity. The proposed operating hours of noon to 2300 hours were acceptable and the installation of odour control equipment was included in the scheme. The Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that the alterations to the windows would be minimal and would not be harmful to the appearance of the premises. He confirmed that any shutters would require separate permission and suggested that a footnote be placed on the application advising the applicant of this requirement. The application was then recommended for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report and subject to the inclusion of the proposed footnote.

Resolved –

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

And that a footnote be placed on the application reminding the applicant that planning permission would be required for the installation of roller shutters.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(c) Harbourne Eph, Brearcliffe Drive, Bradford

Royds

A full planning application for the development of a therapeutic, education and care facility, comprising a learning centre, two residential homes, a multi-use games area (MUGA) and external play areas at Harbourne, Brearcliffe Drive, Bradford - 15/01814/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the property was located in a residential area and had been extended in 1996. The application proposed a partial demolition and remodelling of the existing building with the construction of two residential homes. Only the remodelling required planning permission and the Use Class would remain as C2. The property had an established use as a care home for the elderly and the new development would provide a care home for vulnerable children. The application had been publicised twice as further information had been received and a number of objections had been submitted following both notifications. Consultations had been undertaken and no significant concerns had been raised. Members were informed that the scheme would provide accommodation for vulnerable children within the Bradford District. The proposal would fit in with the existing buildings and would not have a harmful impact on the environment or increase overlooking. Concerns had been raised in relation to noise from the Multi Use Games Area (MUGA), however, this could be managed by the team in charge and a condition restricting the hours of use. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the proposed Learning Centre would operate from 0800 to 1700 hours and 37 car parking spaces would be provided. He stated that there would be a good staff to child ratio, therefore, security and antisocial behaviour should not be an issue, however, if any instances occurred then the police would need to resolve them. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be required to enable yellow lines to be placed around the entrance to the facility and a condition would need to be added if Members were minded to approve the proposal. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the addition of an extra condition regarding the TRO.

In response to Members queries, the Strategic Director, Regeneration clarified that:

- Mesh fencing would be installed.
- The Council had more than met the required publication requirements of the application. The re-advertisement was at the discretion of the Local Authority and 14 days notice had been provided.
- The use of the property was acceptable and the referral of the children was not a planning matter.
- The hours of use of the MUGA was covered by a condition and was restricted to 0900 to 2000 hours Monday to Saturday and 1100 to 1700 on Sundays in light of complaints received.

- The MUGA would not be a public facility.
- Water and sewer systems were covered by Building Control.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and stated that:

- Community engagement had been poor.
- The facility was required, however, this was the wrong location.
- The property used to be an elderly care home and the proposal would turn it into an education establishment with a MUGA that would be noisy.
- The area would be altered.
- Similar facilities were not located in a built up residential area.
- Had the overlooking issues been dealt with properly?
- The replacement of an elderly care home with an outdoor play area would be an issue.
- Security fencing, CCTV systems and lighting would be installed and the appearance would be an issue.
- A prominent unsightly development was not welcomed.
- The mitigation of issues in relation to the conditions and appearance of the proposal should be considered.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Ward Councillor confirmed that the property had previously been a rehabilitation centre and had not had many residents.

An objector was present at the meeting and raised the following concerns:

- The development would be to the east side of the site.
- It would overlook her driveway and garden and remove any privacy.
- The distances would be exceeded.
- The behaviour of the children in the home was a concern, as her child was young and impressionable.
- Specific windows should be changed to skylights in order to safeguard her child and others in the future.

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

- It would be an attractive building and the fencing would be removed.
- The aim was to provide a warm domestic environment.
- There were a number of children in care outside the area who were from Bradford and the Council had requested a local service.
- 37 children could be accommodated, however, all the places would not be filled as a high quality home was required.
- The Organisation operated a number of establishments, had an excellent reputation and made a positive contribution to the community.
- 50 jobs would be created.
- A public meeting had been held in order to engage with the community.
- The children would be able to maintain community links.
- The children would be vulnerable and some may have challenging behaviour.

In response to a Member's question, the applicant confirmed that the public meeting had been advertised locally and residents had attended.

During the discussion Members agreed that it was an excellent scheme that would be provided by a competent organisation with a good track record, however, the lack of communication locally was acknowledged. Members expressed concerns in respect of the restricted operating hours of the MUGA and it was proposed that the relevant condition be removed from the application. It was noted that the issues regarding the lighting and fencing were covered by conditions and the proposed additional condition in relation to the implementation of a TRO was accepted.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration’s technical report and also subject to the removal of condition 16 and the addition of the following condition:

- (i) **No part of the development shall be brought into use until best endeavours to implement a Traffic Regulation Order for parking restrictions around the entrance to the facility has been undertaken by the Highway Authority with all costs borne by the applicant. A drawing indicating the extents and full details of the Traffic Regulation Order shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order to ensure that a safe access is maintained in the interest of highway safety and to accord with policy TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

- (d) **Land North of 39 and 47 Park Crescent, Bradford** **Bolton & Undercliffe**

A full planning application for one dwelling at land to the north of 39 and 47 Park Crescent, Bradford. This is a resubmission of application 14/05299/FUL, proposing amendments to that planning permission - 15/05733/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the construction of the bungalow had commenced and the application proposed amendments to the dormer windows. The original approved scheme included rooflights and the alterations submitted requested two dormer windows with obscure glazing to the northern elevation of the property. The parking provision would be retained, road access would be improved and there would not be any significant amenity issues. The amended application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the removal of duplicated conditions 10 and 11.

In response to a Member’s query it was noted that the objectors were local residents.

The applicant’s representative informed the Panel that the property would be a family home and the dormers were required for space purposes.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration’s technical report and also subject to the removal of duplicated conditions 10 and 11.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(e) St Paul’s CE Primary School, St Paul’s Avenue, Bradford

Wibsey

Full planning permission is sought for the construction of play areas, car park and installation of fencing at St Paul’s Church of England Primary School, St Paul’s Avenue, Bradford - 15/03273/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed the Panel that the application requested the provision of additional play areas at the school, which was situated amongst residential properties and would change the land association from the church to the school. The school and church were listed and the land was not allocated. School type fencing would be installed and objections had been submitted. The Council’s Conservation Team were concerned in relation to the impact of the fencing on the listed buildings and, therefore, it would be a discreet structure. Members were informed that the school would benefit from the additional area as its current play space was constrained and it would only be used by the school during its opening hours. There would already be noise disturbance from the existing school and it was noted that some of the smaller species of trees would have to be removed. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to Members questions, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the purpose of the consultations was to obtain views and comments on the applications. Planning Officers would then evaluate the positives and negatives. In respect of the National Planning Policy Framework the public benefit of the proposal would outweigh the issue of the fencing.

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

- His two children attended and he supported the school.
- The fencing did not cover the whole of the boundary.
- His property was the closest to the school and there was no fence.
- The proposed fence would be 2 foot higher than his garden wall.
- It had been indicated that the fence would be placed away from the boundary.
- Anti social behaviour took place after school hours. The school had been broken into and the police had to be contacted.
- There would be a gap between his house and the fence, but noise would be audible at night.
- The proposed play area had already been broken into on an evening.
- Some of the trees and the graves needed to be moved.
- Should a survey of the wildlife in the grounds be undertaken?
- The fence would be very high and spoil the views.
- Children would climb the fence after school hours and cause problems.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that the fencing should alleviate the current issues and confirmed that there were conditions on the application to ensure that it would be sited away from the wall. He acknowledged that the existing fencing did not cover the entire boundary and that the Home Office would have to be contacted in relation to the graves. A wildlife survey would not be required, as it was not a designated wildlife area and the mature trees would not be removed, however, a footnote could be placed on the application in respect of wildlife issues.

Resolved –

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

And that a footnote be placed on the application drawing the developer’s attention to his duty of care to protected species under separate non-planning legislation.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(f) **Unitarian Church Hall, Broadway Avenue, Bradford**

Little Horton

An outline application for the demolition of a church hall and the construction of five three storey dwellings at Broadway Avenue, Bradford. The application seeks permission for access, appearance, layout and scale - 15/00903/OUT

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was outline for the construction of three terraced and two semi-detached properties and requested that permission for the access, layout, appearance and scale be considered. There was a mix of styles in the location and the properties would be of a similar design to others in the area. Members were informed that the District needed housing and the development would be a small contribution. It was a sustainable brownfield site and the density was considered as acceptable. A number of representations had been submitted, however, the points raised did not carry sufficient weight to justify the refusal of the application. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the proposal was acceptable in principle and there would be sufficient distance between the dwellings. The application was then recommended for approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the replacement of condition 1 with the appropriate reserved matters condition.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration’s technical report and also subject to the removal of condition 1 and the insertion of the following conditions:

(i) **Application for approval of the matters reserved by this permission for subsequent approval by the Local Planning Authority shall be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.**

Reason: To accord with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. (as amended).

- (ii) **Before any development is begun plans showing the landscaping must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To accord with the requirements of Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

- (iii) **The development to which this notice relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the date of the approval of the matters reserved by this permission for subsequent approval by the Local Planning Authority, or in the case of approval of such matters on different dates, the date of the final approval of the last of such matters to be approved.**

Reason: To accord with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(g) **1D Moor Park Drive, Bradford**

Bradford Moor

A full application for the demolition of an existing Madrassa and the construction of a replacement Madrassa at 1D Moor Park Drive, Bradford - 15/03255/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new larger Madrassa within a residential area. The site was constrained and a great deal of negotiation had been undertaken with the Planning Department. Members noted that the original approval for the conversion of the property had been granted in 2003 and the proposal of a larger building had been refused in 2014. A petition and letters of objection had been received along with a letter of support from the Ward Councillor. The representations raised issues in relation to the traffic problems, that the building was currently being used as a Mosque and there were others in the area. No objections had been raised from the consultations. The Strategic Director, Regeneration informed the Panel that the conversion had been approved in 2003 subject to the hours of use and the number of people that would use the facility, however, the latter was not enforceable. He stated that the Madrassa was a class D1 use and the land was not allocated in the Council's Replacement Unitary Development Plan, therefore, the proposal was acceptable in principle. The proposed building's floor space would increase by 30% and there would be a significant intensification of the use. The hours of use could be restricted, however, the facility was in close proximity to neighbouring properties. It was noted that 16 car parking spaces would normally be requested, but 21 had been provided and the building could occupy a large amount of people. The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reason set out in the officer's report.

In response to Members' queries, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that:

- The property was currently used as a Mosque.
- The central hall would be surrounded by other rooms.
- The garages belonged to the houses, were forward facing and could be accessed via their driveways.
- The likely increase in cars and footfall could only be based upon the building control data.

- The Madrassa placed cones on the road in order to control parking in the area.
- The Highways and Environmental Health Departments had not objected to the proposal, however, there may be noise from the building and this could be controlled by a condition. The proposed building would be used as a Madrassa, which was its present use, so there should not be any statutory noise nuisance.
- The cones had been placed on the access way and it was not an adopted highway.

A representative of the applicant was present at the meeting and made the following comments:

- As part of the approval granted in 2003, the unadopted road was improved to Council standards.
- It would be ensured that the access would be kept clear at all times.
- The parking sign had been put up by the organisation as indiscriminate parking had taken place on an evening.
- The organisation had been at the site since 2003.
- The building was old and required replacing.
- The Planning Department had been contacted in order to try to address the issues.
- There had not been any issues previously.
- The new building would only be slight larger.

Another representative of the applicant was at the meeting and raised the following points:

- They wanted to provide dedicated classes for children.
- Specialist rooms had been proposed.
- A main hall was required so that assemblies and parents evenings could take place.
- Extra support was required for the pupils.
- The proposed building would be 96 square metres larger, which was 26%.
- The operating hours were required up to 2100 hours as the classes sometimes went beyond 2000 hours.
- An extension of the amenities was required.
- The building would not be a Mosque and all the facilities would be for the children.

In response to queries from the Chair, the applicant's representative confirmed that currently 56 children attended on a daily basis and they wanted to increase the number to 78, with 30 adults. The facility would undertake children's worship only.

Members then posed further questions and the Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that class D1 was covered worship and the applicants could change the use to a Mosque or vice versa. He indicated that the class of the property could be restricted and that permitted development rights could be removed so that the building could not become a free school.

During the discussion concerns were raised in relation to the size of the building and if it was to be used as a Mosque.

Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(h) **32 Arnford Close, Bradford**

Bowling & Barkerend

A full planning application for the change of use of the existing dwelling house to a class D1 Islamic education centre at 32 Arnford Close, Bradford - 15/03993/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application requested a change of use of the existing house to an Islamic education centre. The property was located in a quiet residential area and would have an impact on residential amenity. It was proposed that the facility would be open from 1000 hours to 2100 hours seven days per week and accommodate eight people per room. This could result in approximately 25 to 30 people being in the property and create a significant intensification of the use. Members were informed that it would be difficult to control the activity at the property and a condition to restrict the hours of operation would not help. The proposal would not produce any major highway safety issues, however, it would seriously affect residents’ amenity. The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reason set out in the report.

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

- The Centre would be operated by residents.
- The neighbours had been consulted and had not objected to the proposal.
- The Centre was not connected to the nearby Mosque.
- There was a field behind the house.
- There was a primary school entrance in the vicinity.
- There was already a large amount of traffic in the area.
- The number of attendees could be looked at and additional facilities provided if required.
- The property had been vacant since September 2014.
- Parking was available.
- There would not be a set curriculum for education and the aim would be to provide a safe clean place to gain knowledge.

Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(i) **9 Carter Street, Bradford**

Bowling & Barkerend

A full retrospective planning application for the change of use of the property from an office to a dwelling house at 9 Carter Street, Bradford - 15/05484/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. Members were informed that the application was for a change of use of a property in an employment zone from an office to a dwelling. The premises had previously been used as a residential house, however, an appeal had been refused before as it was situated in a commercial area. The whole area was designated for employment use and the change of use had been deemed as unacceptable for any future occupiers on the grounds of residential amenity and the impact on the function of an employment zone. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the application had supporting information that the property was not suitable for office use, however, there was no long term marketing solution. He stated that there was a need to maintain employment land and the Planning Inspector's view should be taken into consideration. The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reasons set out in the report.

In response to Members' queries, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the petition had not stated why the application was being supported and those that had signed it lived some distance from the site. He stated that the property did not provide adequate living conditions and the Planning Inspector had supported that view that it was unacceptable.

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

- The Council's Core Strategy supported the re-use of empty properties.
- The planning system was preventing the use of an empty house.
- Many people were interested in the tenancy of the property.
- The house benefited from a fitted kitchen, double glazing and central heating.
- The previous tenant had not wanted to leave the house, but had to do so due to an enforcement notice.
- Commercial estate agents had stated that the premises was not suitable for office use due to its size and the lack of a market and they believed that it would remain unoccupied.
- No objections had been received.
- If granted, the property would be occupied by the end of the week.
- A possible tenant worked opposite the house.
- A perfectly good house was being kept empty and it just required planning permission.

In response to a Member's query, the applicant's agent confirmed that there was a piece of land behind the property that the applicant was trying to purchase.

During the discussion Members acknowledged that the District needed housing and agreed that the property could be used for residential purposes without causing any prejudice to the surrounding businesses.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

The proposed residential use of the building within an Employment Zone would be acceptable for existing and future residents and would not prejudice the operation of the surrounding industrial and commercial uses and would therefore not be contrary to policies UR3, D1 and E6 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(j) Requests for Enforcement/Prosecution Action

(i) 10 The Avenue, Clayton, Bradford Clayton & Fairweather Green

Construction of two outbuildings to side and front of property - 14/00987/ENFAPP

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 10 November 2015.

(ii) 12 Grove Road, Shipley Heaton

Construction of detached outbuilding - 14/00730/ENFAPP

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 18 November 2015.

(iii) 12 Melbourne Grove, Bradford Bradford Moor

Unauthorised single storey front extension - 14/01118/ENFUNA

The unauthorised single storey front extension remains in place and on 10 November 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(iv) 205-207 Great Horton Road, Bradford City

Unauthorised roller shutters - 15/00718/ENFUNA

On 10 November 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(v) 25 Leeds Old Road, Bradford Bradford Moor

Unauthorised roller shutters - 15/00347/ENFUNA

The unauthorised externally mounted roller shutters remain in place and on 29 October 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(vi) **278 Allerton Road, Bradford** **Thornton & Allerton**

Unauthorised cladding of shop front - 13/00018/ENFUNA

The unauthorised timber cladding remains in place and on 29 October 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(vii) **31 Sanderson Avenue, Bradford** **Wibsey**

Unauthorised business use - 15/00282/ENFCOU

On 5 November 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(viii) **342 Great Horton Road, Bradford** **City**

Unauthorised roller shutters - 15/00818/ENFUNA

On 10 November 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(ix) **46-48 Duckworth Lane, Bradford** **Toller**

Unauthorised roller shutters - 14/00999/ENFUNA

The unauthorised externally mounted roller shutters remain in place and on 26 October 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(x) **48 Brantwood Road, Bradford** **Heaton**

Construction of raised decking to rear of property - 15/00788/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 10 November 2015.

(xi) **5 Acre Lane, Bradford** **Eccleshill**

Unauthorised structure - 14/00778/ENFUNA

The unauthorised static caravan type structure remains in place at the property and on 10 November 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(xii) **58 Leeds Old Road, Bradford** **Bradford Moor**

Unauthorised extractor flues - 14/00269/ENFUNA

Retrospective planning application 15/00327/FUL for the extractor flues was refused by the Council in March 2015. An appeal against the Council's decision was dismissed by The Planning Inspectorate in July 2015.

The unauthorised extractor flues remain in place and on 27 October 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(g) Decisions made by the Secretary of State

The Panel noted the following appeal decisions taken by the Secretary of State:

APPEALS ALLOWED

(i) 1 Third Avenue, Bradford

Bradford Moor

Retrospective application for front porch - Case No: 15/01387/HOU
Appeal Ref: 15/00109/APPHOU

(ii) 13 Uplands Crescent, Bradford

Queensbury

Construction of extension to front and rear - Case No: 15/01847/HOU
Appeal Ref: 15/00089/APPHOU

(iii) 3 Hawes Terrace, Bradford

Wibsey

Retrospective planning application for front dormers and rear outbuilding not constructed in accordance with Planning Permission 12/05086/HOU - Case No: 15/02076/HOU
Appeal Ref: 15/00111/APPHOU

(iv) Land South of 66 to 72 Poplar Grove, Bradford

Royds

Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of nine new dwellings (mixture of 4-5 bedrooms) with access road - Case No: 14/04402/OUT
Appeal Ref: 15/00080/APPFL2

APPEALS DISMISSED

(v) 1 Dyehouse Fold, Oakenshaw, Bradford

Wyke

Construction of a two-storey side extension and retaining wall to the front and side of the dwelling - Case No: 15/00568/HOU
Appeal Ref: 15/00066/APPHOU

(vi) 10 The Avenue Clayton, Bradford

Clayton & Fairweather Green

Construction of two new outbuildings for use as storage and sun house - Case No: 15/01181/HOU
Appeal Ref: 15/00091/APPHOU

(vii) **205 Manningham Lane, Bradford** **Manningham**

Retrospective application for the construction of three roller shutters - Case No:
15/00945/FUL
Appeal Ref: 15/00075/APPMC1

(viii) **205 Manningham Lane, Bradford** **Manningham**

Retrospective application for three fascia signs and one hoarding - Case No:
15/00944/ADV
Appeal Ref: 15/00076/APPAD1

(ix) **308 Harrogate Road, Bradford** **Eccleshill**

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 13/01011/ENFUNA
Appeal Ref: 15/00035/APPENF

(xi) **327 Girlington Road, Bradford** **Toller**

Installation of one fascia sign - Case No: 15/00429/ADV
Appeal Ref: 15/00101/APPAD1

(xii) **5 Acre Lane, Eccleshill, Bradford** **Eccleshill**

Retrospective application for granny annexe to rear of property - custom built static
caravan - Case No: 15/00108/HOU
Appeal Ref: 15/00090/APPHOU

(xiii) **Former 524 Great Horton Road, Bradford** **City**

Appeal against Works to Listed Building - Case No: 12/00822/ENFLBC
Appeal Ref: 14/00120/APPENF

(xiv) **Land Adjacent 78, 80 & 82 Silverhill Road, Bradford** **Bradford Moor**

Change of use from public highway to garden curtilage - Case No: 14/04105/FUL
Appeal Ref: 15/00103/APPFL2

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

Chair

**Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting
of the Panel.**