

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday 20 January 2016 at City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 1005
Adjourned 1300
Reconvened 1330
Site Visit 1330 - 1425
Concluded 1435

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
Rickard	Amran	Reid
Whiteley	Ferriby	
	Lee	
	Wainwright	

Observers: Councillor Akhtar (Minute 28(h), Councillor Azam (Minute 28(g)) and Councillor Dunbar (Minute 28(c) and (e))

Councillor Lee in the Chair

24. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The following disclosures of interest were received in the interest of clarity:

Councillor Amran disclosed that the property had belonged to a friend and he knew the applicants in relation to Minute 28(d) and he therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this 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).

Councillor Amran disclosed that he knew the applicant’s representative in a professional capacity in relation to Minute 28(g) and he therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this 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).

Councillor Amran disclosed that he had been approached by the applicant but had referred him to another Ward Councillor in relation to Minute 28(i).

Councillor Reid disclosed that he had previous knowledge of the property in relation to Minute 28(b).

ACTION: *Interim City Solicitor*



25. **MINUTES**

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2015 be signed as a correct record.

ACTION: *Interim City Solicitor*

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

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

27. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

28. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS**

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

(a) **10 Ransdale Grove, Bradford**

Little Horton

A householder planning application for the construction of a single storey side extension and a part two-storey, part single storey rear extension at 10 Ransdale Grove, Bradford - 15/06183/HOU

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed a small single storey extension to the side along with a part two storey, part single storey extension to the rear. The proposal complied with all Council policies, however, a slight amendment had been made to install obscure glazing at a rear window to prevent overlooking. 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) **1A Leylands Lane, Bradford**

Heaton

A full planning application for retention of Use Class D1 to ground floor and change of use from one residential unit to three at first and second floor at 1A Leylands Lane, Heaton, Bradford - 15/06928/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the property was currently a place of worship on the ground floor with a residential unit on the upper floor. The proposed scheme would retain the Use Class D1 to the ground floor and subdivide the upper floors into three flats. The application was then recommended for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

A Member queried what work was currently ongoing in the property. It was reported that the ground floor was being refurbished and the renovations were not retrospective.

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

(c) **21 Syringa Avenue, Sandy Lane, Bradford**

Thornton & Allerton

An application for the construction of a part two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension at 21 Syringa Avenue, Sandy Lane, Bradford - 15/06912/HOU

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed the construction of extensions to the side and rear of the property. A number of representations had been received including one from a Ward Councillor and the issues raised were detailed within the officer’s report. Members were informed that the Council’s Householder Supplementary Planning Document (HSPD) came into effect from 2012 and the scheme complied with the guidance. The development would not result in any overshadowing or overdominance of windows and was in accordance with Council policies. It also provided sufficient off street parking provision. The Strategic Director, Regeneration then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and stated that:

- He was representing local residents.
- The neighbours in the properties behind had not received notification.
- It was a busy road that already suffered from parking and access issues.
- The proposed extensions raised potential flooding issues.
- The extension exceeded the boundary and the issues should be resolved.
- The application should be refused.

In response to the points raised the Strategic Director, Regeneration clarified that:

- The blocking of driveways was a police matter.
- The publicity had been carried out as per the statutory guidelines and the immediate neighbours had been notified.
- Flooding was a matter for building control.
- Boundary disputes were a private civil matter and the matter could be resolved via the Party Wall Act.

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

- Neighbours had objected to the application.
- The proposal would result in the loss of the majority of the driveway and cause issues.
- The neighbour adjacent was disabled and needed access.
- There was a natural spring under the property and water collected under the floors.
- The water would have to flow elsewhere due to the foundations.
- The extensions would encroach, overlook and affect the privacy of the adjacent property.
- The properties to the rear would be overlooked.
- The proposed extension would be constructed up to the boundary.
- It had been stated that there would be a gap at the boundary and the submitted plans were not final.
- If the front garden of the property was used for parking, this would create water and flooding issues and also damage the verge.
- The proposed extension would result in a loss of sunlight to his property and garden.
- The development would be out of character in the street scene.
- The house could become a five bedroom property if one of the proposed bathrooms was converted.

In response to the comments made, the Strategic Director confirmed that:

- Parking could be formed in the front garden under permitted development rights providing it was a porous surface.
- The underground streams would be addressed under building regulations.
- The property would not have any windows to the side elevation, so there would not be any overlooking.
- The distance from the rear windows to other properties was 18 metres.
- The proposed extensions had been designed specifically not to overshadow neighbouring properties.
- The proposal was compliant with Council policies and did not affect other properties.

The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and echoed that the application complied with Council policies.

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

(d) **37 Westwood Avenue, Bradford**

Bolton & Undercliffe

A full planning application for the construction of a first floor to a bungalow, with extensions to the side and rear at 37 Westwood Avenue, Five-Lane Ends, Bradford - 15/05482/FUL. The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the scheme proposed the part demolition of the existing bungalow and the construction of side and rear extensions with

the addition of a first floor. This would result in a two storey house with five bedrooms which would be substantially larger than the current bungalow but comparable to other houses in the area. The site was screened by boundary hedging which would be retained and the property would sit in line with other houses. The separation distances complied with all the criteria within Council policies and there would not be an adverse impact on neighbours. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the existing driveway and garage would be retained and an additional space at the front of the house created in order to provide four car parking spaces. He then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The applicant was present at the meeting and informed the Panel that the alterations were required as he had a large family to accommodate. The proposed parking would be sufficient as they only had two vehicles.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director confirmed that the existing access would remain and the parking provision would be extended to the front of the property.

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

- (e) **Duke of York Inn, Dean Lane Head, Old Allen Road, Thornton, Bradford** **Thornton & Allerton**
- (i) A full application for the change of use from a public house to three dwellings at the Duke of York Inn, Dean Lane Head, Old Allen Road, Thornton, Bradford - 15/03021/FUL
- (ii) A listed building application for the change of use from a public house to three dwellings at the Duke of York Inn, Dean Lane Head, Old Allen Road, Thornton, Bradford - 15/03022/LBC

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the proposal was to convert a former public house that was listed and had been empty for a considerable time to three residential properties. There were other residential properties on the row and the scheme would reinstate the features, remodel the building and provide car parking and garden space. It was noted that planning permission for the construction of six dwellings had been approved a number of years ago. Members were informed that there would not be any impact on the Green Belt, as the proposal would not be overly extended and the principle of residential use had already been established. The scheme would re-use a vacant building and the proposed changes to improve the property were covered by conditions. Neighbours would benefit from the application as their residential amenity would be improved and less traffic would be generated from the use. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that additional representations had been received in relation to the drainage, cess pit and septic tank and, therefore, it was suggested that additional conditions regarding the drainage be placed on the application in order to cover these issues, however, they would only apply within the red line boundary. He stated that condition 9 could be revised to cover the capacity and size of the septic tank. There were no permitted development rights as it was

a listed building and the relevant conditions had been placed on the application. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the revised drainage condition.

In response to Members questions, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the previous planning permission was still extant.

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

- Local residents had raised concerns in relation to the drainage.
- The septic tank had not been identified on the plans.
- Would the new construction affect the septic tank?
- The proposed plan did not mention the use of a new drainage system.
- The deeds stated that Dean Lane Head Farm had sole right to the use of the septic tank.
- The septic tank had previously overflowed.
- The two adjacent cottages were connected to the existing cesspit.
- The cottages did not have their own drainage system and were included in the former public house's system.
- Where would the occupants of Unit 1 park?

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Regeneration clarified that the drainage issues were covered under building regulations and any queries regarding the deeds were a civil matter. He explained that the conditions on the application and building regulations would cover the issues raised. In relation to parking, it was noted that there would be provision for Unit 1 as two spaces per dwelling had been allowed for Units 2 and 3.

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

- He had lived in his property for 10 years and the public house had been closed for over 5 years.
- The building had been subject to anti-social behaviour and he was grateful it was to be used again.
- The proposed planning application was not an issue.
- Drainage and sewerage problems were the main concern.
- The overflow from the manhole covers seeped across the road.

The Chair acknowledged that the septic tank was an issue, but noted that the holding area had been cleared of a blockage and a new septic tank could be installed.

During the discussion Members requested that the drainage condition be amended to ensure that the scheme be approved prior to commencement of the development and that a parking space be provided for Unit 1.

Resolved –

(i) 15/03021/FUL

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 amendment of condition 9 and 11 as follows:

Condition 9:

Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved plans, before the development hereby permitted commences details of a scheme for foul and surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Specifically but not exclusively, the details shall include:

- 1. ground percolation tests,**
- 2. the location of septic tanks and cess pits, their capacity and filter size, current and proposed method of disposal of final effluent, and**
- 3. calculations of foul and surface water disposal.**

The scheme so approved shall thereafter be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt to ensure the adequate provision of sewage treatment facilities for the development and to accord with policies UR3 and NR16 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

Condition 11:

Before the development is brought into use, the off-street car parking facility for Unit 2 and Unit 3 shall be laid out, hard surfaced, sealed and drained within the curtilage of the site in accordance with the approved drawings and parking provision for Unit 1 shall also be provided. The gradient shall be no steeper than 1 in 15 except where otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to accord with Policy TM12 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

(ii) 15/03022/LBC

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

(f) Land North of 25 Prospect Street, Woodside, Bradford

Royds

Construction of a detached dwelling at land north of 25 Prospect Street, Woodside, Bradford - 15/01523/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the proposal was to construct a detached dwelling with access between two properties. Previous applications for the site had been refused on highway reasons, however, the access on to Halifax Road had now been addressed. The site was located in a sustainable location and the proposal would achieve an adequate density. The scheme was small scale and the design would fit in with the non-uniformed street scene. It did not create any residential amenity issues and two off street parking spaces would be provided. The Strategic Director, Regeneration then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

An objector was present at the meeting and stated that:

- The land had been submitted for auction in 2009.

- The site should remain as green land.
- Previous applications had not been granted due to highway issues.
- There was a clause in the registration and a payment had to be made to the Council.
- He had been misled.
- He had maintained the unadopted road for 40 years and it was being washed away.
- The condition of the unadopted road would deteriorate due to heavy traffic and no one would be responsible.
- Parking was an issue.
- The proposed wall would encourage cars to be parked further into the road, so passengers could get out.
- Cars parked on Halifax Road.
- Further consideration was required.
- The applicant should be responsible for repairing the unadopted road.

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

- The road standard would be to that depicted in the submitted drawings and would provide safe access and egress onto Halifax Road. The developer would have to repair the unadopted road if it was damaged and adequate access would be beneficial to the sale of the property.
- Further improvements to the road could be requested by Members of the Panel, however, there were issues regarding water permeability.
- Sufficient off street parking would be provided.
- The sale of the land was not a planning issue and it was not restricted to build on.
- Planning permission could be granted if there were covenants on the land.
- Conditions regarding the improvement of the unadopted road would have to be commensurate to the proposed development. Construction traffic may cause damage to the road, however, the developer would have to resolve any issues with the owner of the road.

During the discussion the Chair acknowledged that the road would not be improved to Council standards as only one property was proposed, however, it was noted that the developer was willing to make improvements. In response the Strategic Director, Regeneration indicated that a condition could be placed on the application that a survey of the road condition be undertaken prior to any development, though this would only cover the application site.

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 following additional condition:

- (i) **Before the development hereby permitted commences a dilapidation survey of Prospect Street shall be submitted in writing to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The developer shall make good, to a recognised road construction standard and the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, any subsequent damage, including that made by associated third parties, to the highway resulting from or associated with the development of the application site.**

Reason: To ensure reasonable maintenance of the existing means of access in the interests of highway safety and to accord with Policy TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(g) **Shires Business Park, Becksid Road, Great Horton, Bradford** **City**

A full planning application for change of use of part of the building from Use Classes B1/B2/B8 to Use Class D2 (indoor football pitches) at the former Shires Ltd building, Becksid Road, Great Horton, Bradford - 15/05994/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application was for a change of use from a part industrial building to indoor football pitches. It was noted that some alterations to the entrance had been proposed and the layout of the car parking had identified 60 spaces. Members were informed that a previous application had been refused in 2014 and the appeal had been dismissed. The Planning Inspector had been satisfied with the use of the building, even though it proposed a recreation use within an employment zone. A strong analysis of the employment demand had been undertaken and it had been identified that there was very little requirement in the area. The Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that the creation of employment would be similar to the current Use Class B1 and indicated that as only a small element of the building would be altered the site could easily be brought back into employment use. He confirmed that there were no residential properties in the immediate vicinity. Alterations to the access along with the provision of 60 car parking spaces and a dedicated pedestrian entrance had been proposed and the Planning Inspector had accepted these improvements. The Use Class D2 would not generate any additional traffic to the current employment use and the scheme was acceptable in principle. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

- Traffic separation occurred on the site.
- Vehicles were able to turn around.
- Becksid Road was very busy.
- The proposed use was very unlikely to generate additional traffic and would not cause further harm to highway safety.
- It was not known why a previous application had been withdrawn.
- The proposed operating hours were 0800 to 2300 and a condition may be appropriate.
- Soundproofing had not been proposed. The distance between the site and residential properties was considerable.

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

- The situation was similar to that in May 2014 when a previous application had been recommended for approval.
- Substantial objections had been raised in the locality and the application had been refused.
- The Planning Inspector had agreed with reason for refusal under highway safety grounds.

- There was a school in the vicinity.
- The five proposed pitches would occupy 17% of the building.
- Were officers aware of the other uses in the building and it was unclear whether they had planning permission.
- A DVD and petition had been submitted.
- The area was very busy on a Friday evening due to the nearby Mosque and school.
- There was a car wash and builder's merchant in the area.
- Cannon Mills had a busy Sunday market.
- On a Sunday the traffic in the area was horrendous.
- It was an employment zone.
- It was incorrect that only 17% of the building was to be used, as there were more uses in the building.

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

- The use of the site would not affect the traffic on the road.
- The Planning Inspector had been concerned about the internal layout of the site.
- Other business on the site may not require planning permission.
- Other uses on the site would be taken into account when the application was considered.
- The site was in an employment zone and the other uses within the building and vicinity were known.

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

- The officer's report was well written.
- The Planning Inspector had stated that the site was within an employment zone.
- Football pitches were an acceptable exception to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and their employment was comparable.
- The scheme would benefit the community.
- A wide range of age groups participated in 5-a-side football.
- The facility would provide a community use and supports health needs.
- There was a shortage of the proposed facility in the District.
- The site was not close to houses and would not have a direct impact on residents.
- The noise would be contained within the building.
- The access and egress of vehicles would create noise but it would not have a direct impact.
- Access would be gained from Beckside Road.
- Beckside Road did not have any highway safety issues.
- The previous reasons for refusal had been addressed.

Following a site visit, Members acknowledged the adequate parking facilities, that buildings had been demolished and the different configuration of the site.

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

(h) **236 Heaton Road, Bradford**

Change of use of ground floor of dwelling to estate agency (A2), single-storey rear extension and conversion of existing roofspace to bedrooms including front and rear dormer windows at 236 Heaton Road, Bradford - 15/06909/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the proposal was to change the use of the ground floor of the property from residential to an estate agency, with an extension to the rear. It was noted that two previous similar applications had been refused due to the harm from noise on a residential setting and the lack of disabled access and outdoor amenity. The proposal submitted was similar and had been amended slightly, but it still proposed a commercial use in a residential area with no noise insulation measures. The design was acceptable, the extension to the rear had been reduced in size and the proposed dormer windows complied with Council policy, however, the scheme did not provide proper disabled access and the route was outside the control of the applicant. The Strategic Director, Regeneration then recommended the application for refusal as per the reasons set out in the officer's report.

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

- The size of the proposed extension had been reduced and complied with Council policies.
- There was a pedestrian alleyway to the rear of the premises.
- There was no justification as to why an internal ramp could not be provided for disabled access.
- Further consideration could be given to the application if the property was to be soundproofed and this would mitigate the issues raised, however, the details would have to be provided in the first instance.
- The rear access to the property was gained via a passageway to the front of the property, which appeared to be narrow.
- Residents had a right to enjoy a peaceful life in their property free from overlooking and overshadowing. Residential amenities could be damaged and proper mitigations were required of any effects. The proposed use would have a commercial disturbance on residents.
- The noise generated inside the building would be an issue and if adequate soundproofing had been proposed it may have resolved the issue.
- The property was currently a family home and the proposal was to change it to a commercial use. A previous application had been refused and this application did not address the original reasons for refusal.
- The applicants could turn the premises into a barbers shop without planning permission.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting in support of the applicant and made the following points:

- It was disappointing that the application had been recommended for refusal.
- The reasons for refusal had been addressed.
- The proposed extension had been reduced in size and disabled access had been provided.
- The design of the frontage had been altered as requested.
- The proposal would not impact on the Conservation area.

- There had not been any objections from the Highways Department or local residents.
- There were barbers, grocers and a beauty salon, which were the same use class, in the vicinity.
- It was a mixed use area.
- The applicant wanted to establish a small business so that his wife could work from home.
- The application should be approved.

A Member questioned whether the application could be deferred in order for the soundproofing issue to be resolved. In response the Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that the applicant had been given the opportunity to resolve the previous reasons for refusal.

Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(i) **37 Heights Lane, Daisy Hill, Bradford**

Heaton

A full planning application for the construction of a new dwelling within the curtilage of 37 Heights Lane, Daisy Hill, Bradford - 15/02901/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the proposal was to construct a new dwelling in the curtilage of the existing property within an area of traditional style properties. The scheme was acceptable in principle, as it would meet the housing demand and the site was located within a sustainable location. It was noted that there were no issues in relation to residential amenity, as the scheme had been carefully designed not to create overshadowing or overlooking, however, visual amenity was an issue. The Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that the proposal was a modern design, which the Council would encourage in an appropriate location, however, it was out of character in the area. He reported that the scale and design was incongruous in the street scene and that a number of concerns had been raised in respect of highway safety. 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 principle of development was accepted and the proposal was neither over nor under development. He explained that the application had been assessed against Council policies and that under policy D1, the design must fit in with the area.

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

- He had lived in the large property for 20 years and wished to remain in the area.
- The proposed scheme would be environmentally friendly, wheelchair accessible and have a lift.
- The development was acceptable in principle and on highway safety grounds.
- The application had been recommended for refusal on visual amenity grounds.
- The properties in the vicinity were varied in style and use.
- The design incorporated many environmental benefits.

- Neighbours supported the proposal.

During the discussion Members acknowledged that the District had a housing crisis and the proposed property accorded with Section 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It was noted that there was an eclectic mixture of buildings in the area and a standard house would look out of place. Members then commended the future proof, eco friendly and innovative design of the proposed property.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

The proposed dwelling would be acceptable in principle and the design would be in keeping with the surrounding area and as no other planning matters had been raised it would therefore comply with policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

And that the application be subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The development to which this notice relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.**

Reason: To accord with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

- (ii) Before construction of any of the buildings that comprise part of the development hereby permitted commences above damp-proof level, arrangements shall be made with the Local Planning Authority for the inspection of all facing (to comprise natural stone) and roofing materials to be used. The development shall be constructed of the materials subsequently approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials in the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policies UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (iii) Before any part of the development hereby permitted is brought into use, the off-street car parking facility shall be constructed of porous materials, or made to direct run-off water from a hard surface to a permeable or porous area within the curtilage of the site, and laid out with a gradient no steeper than 1 in 15.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, drainage and to accord with policies UR3, TM12 and NR16 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (iv) Before the development hereby permitted commences, details of a scheme for separate foul and surface water drainage, including existing water courses, culverts, land drains and any balancing works or off-site works, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Surface water must first be investigated for potential disposal through use of sustainable drainage techniques and the developer must submit to the Local Planning Authority a report detailing the results of such an investigation together with the design for disposal of surface water using such techniques**

or proof that they would be impractical. The scheme so approved shall thereafter be implemented in full before the first occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure proper drainage of the site and to accord with policies UR3 and NR16 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- (v) **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any subsequent equivalent legislation) no further windows or other openings shall be formed in the north or south side elevations of the development hereby approved without prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties and to accord with policies UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(j) **Requests for Enforcement/Prosecution Action**

(i) **195 Lumb Lane, Bradford**

Manningham

Unauthorised roller shutters - 14/00960/ENFUNA

On 24 November 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(ii) **2a Beechwood Drive, Wibsey, Bradford**

Wibsey

Unauthorised construction of dwelling house - 14/01076/ENFAPP

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) therefore authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 8 September 2015.

(iii) **27 Enfield Parade, Bradford**

Wibsey

Without planning permission the construction of a single storey extension with overhanging roof structure to the rear of the premises - 14/00690/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) under delegated powers authorised enforcement action on 21 September 2015 requiring the demolition of the extension and removal of the resulting materials.

(iv) **29 Northside Terrace, Bradford**

Great Horton

Unauthorised vehicle repairs and storage - 15/00660/ENFCOU

On 16 October 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(v) **570 Manchester Road, Bradford**

Unauthorised roller shutter - 14/00906/ENFUNA

On 24 November 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(vi) **64 Gain Lane, Bradford**

Bradford Moor

Unauthorised single storey side extension - 15/00361/ENFUNA

The unauthorised single storey side extension remains in place and on 16 December 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(vii) **79 Kenley Parade, Bradford**

Great Horton

Change of use from residential to mixed use of residential and teaching establishment - 13/00313/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 30 September 2015.

(viii) **8 Hawthorne Avenue, Bradford**

Bradford Moor

Unauthorised structure - 14/00529/ENFUNA

The unauthorised structure remains in place and on 30 September 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(ix) **93 Duchy Drive, Bradford**

Heaton

Without planning permission the construction of a dormer window extension to the rear of the property - 13/00302/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) under delegated powers authorised enforcement action on 3 November 2015 requiring that either:

- The side window of the dormer window be obscurely glazed and fixed and the materials of the dormer window to match the roof of the dwelling; or
- Demolish the dormer window extension repairing any damage to the property. Demolition of the extension and removal of the resulting materials.

(x) **A Baldwin & Company Builders Ltd, Southfield Lane, Bradford**

Great Horton

A car sales business operating from a former car park to the rear retail premises at 121 Southfield Lane and fronting onto the residential cul de sac of Halton Place - 15/00803/ENFUNA

On 22 December 2015 the Area Planning Manager authorised enforcement action to require the use to cease.

(xi) **Land North of 17 Harehill Road, Bradford**

Breach of conditions 5, 6 and 7 of planning permission 14/01151/FUL - 15/00316/ENFCON

On 8 December 2015 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice (Breach of Condition).

(xii) **The Focus Centre, Ingleby Road, Bradford**

Great Horton

Containerised storage facility within the rear car park of the mill building which involves the siting of multiple extra-large storage containers on block work piers with associated walling - 15/00111/ENFCOU

On 22 December 2015 the Area Planning Manager authorised enforcement action to require the development to be removed.

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 DISMISSED

(i) **174 Westgate, Bradford**

City

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 14/00500/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00052/APPENF

(ii) **2 Como Grove, Bradford**

Toller

Conversion of loft with additional dormer windows and change roof from hipped to gable –

Case No: 15/01101/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00118/APPHOU

(iii) **206 Southfield Lane, Bradford**

Great Horton

Appeal against Discontinuance Notice - Case No: 14/00845/ENFADV

Appeal Ref: 14/00138/APPDIS

(iv) **220 - 222 City Road, Bradford**

Manningham

Retrospective application for the display of advertisements to exterior of building - Case No: 14/05097/LBC

Appeal Ref: 15/00048/APPLB2

(v) **220 City Road, Bradford**

Manningham

Retrospective application for display of signage to external walls and within window openings - Case No: 14/05098/ADV

Appeal Ref: 15/00049/APPAD2

(vi) **387 Little Horton Lane, Bradford**

Little Horton

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 14/01151/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00082/APPENF

(vii) **53 Fitzroy Road, Bradford**

Bradford Moor

Construction of front stone porch - Case No: 15/03425/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00126/APPHOU

(viii) **69 Athol Road, Bradford**

Manningham

Construction of single storey rear extension - Case No: 15/01252/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00116/APPHOU

(ix) **Croft Top, 8 Town Lane, Bradford**

Idle & Thackley

Retrospective planning application for the construction of new palisade metal fence 6ft in height to replace the old existing metal chain fence - Case No: 15/00593/FUL

Appeal Ref: 15/00102/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.

i:\minutes\plb20Jan

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER