

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday, 11 May 2016 at Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.00 am
Concluded 12.30 pm

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
Rickard Whiteley	Wainwright Amran Ferriby	Reid

Councillor Wainwright in the Chair

Apologies: Councillor Doreen Lee

Observer: Councillor Dunbar (Minute 42.1(6))

38. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The following disclosure of interest was received in the interest of clarity:

Councillor Amran disclosed that he was the co-owner of the property in relation to Minute 42i(1) 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).

ACTION: City Solicitor

39. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meetings held on 20 January and 10 February 2016 be signed as a correct record.

40. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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



41. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

42. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

The Strategic Director, Regeneration presented **Document "Q"** and **"R"**. Plans and photographs were displayed and/or tabled in respect of each application and representations summarised.

42.1 Document "Q" - relating to items recommended for approval or refusal.

1. 137 ALLERTON ROAD, BRADFORD

Clayton & Fairweather Green

A full planning application for the change of use of land to a garden with new drive and parking area to the rear of 137 Allerton Road, Allerton, Bradford. The application is partially retrospective as the new drive and access from Rhodesway have already been formed - 16/01853/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed a change of use of land to a garden with a new drive and parking area. The land to the rear was allocated as an open green space and the current access road was narrow with poor visibility. Members were informed that the proposed access point would be on Rhodesway and would provide sufficient visibility. It was suggested that the permitted development rights for the construction of outbuildings on the land be removed and that an additional condition be placed on the application that the details of the gates be supplied.

In response to questions, Members were informed that:

- The land was a garden and would not affect the Urban Greenspace.
- An application to build a house on the land could be refused as it was Urban Greenspace.
- The application was partially retrospective as it was clear that the access was already there.
- The access between 135 and 137 Rhodesway was not supported as it was not substantial, however, it could be retained as a footway only.
- A condition in relation to the existing access could be placed on the application in order to retain it as a pedestrian walkway but prohibit vehicles.



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 addition of the following condition:

- (i) **Before the first use of the development hereby permitted the existing vehicular access point between 135 and 137 Allerton Road shall be closed to vehicles in accordance with details submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted. This shall then be retained as such thereafter.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to accord with Policy TM19A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

2. 2 GATHORNE STREET, BRADFORD

City

A full application for a retrospective change of use to a radio station and retention of radio aerial at 2 Gathorne Street, Great Horton, Bradford - 16/00333/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application was a retrospective change of use to a radio station. The host building was an attractive Victorian property that was located in a mainly residential area on a busy commercial road. The radio transmitted over the internet 4 hours per day and was a small scale business, therefore, it would not create additional traffic or noise. A number of objections and a petition had been submitted, but had not raised substantiated planning issues. 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:

- Enforcement action could be taken if the hours of operation were breached and this would be reliant on neighbours providing information.
- The use was not harmful, so wider operating hours could be considered, however, they had been suggested by the applicant. If additional time was required, an amendment could be submitted.
- The only transmission was through the Internet and there had not been any mention of interference.



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

3. 329 TOLLER LANE, BRADFORD

Toller

Double storey rear extension, front porch and outbuilding at 329 Toller Lane, Heaton, Bradford - 16/01549/HOU

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the proposal was to construct a two storey rear extension, a front porch and an outbuilding. There was currently a large garage at the property and this would be replaced by the new outbuilding. A significant element of the development was at the rear of the property and would have minimal visual impact. It was noted that no objections had been received and no overshadowing or overlooking would occur. Members were informed that the applicant was a relative of a member of staff within the Planning Department and the application was then recommended for approval.

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

- The property was vacant.
- It was to be a family home.
- Some of the work could be completed under permitted development rights.
- The proposed double storey rear extension reciprocated the neighbour’s extension.
- The conservatory would be located in an infill area.
- Parking provision for two vehicles would be provided.
- The proposed outbuilding would be located in the footprint of the existing garage.
- The applicant was willing to comply with all conditions.

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



4. 342 GREAT HORTON ROAD, BRADFORD

City

Full application for the construction of a single storey side extension at 342 Great Horton Road, Horton Grange, Bradford - 16/00945/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 an extension to a restaurant over an existing decked area, which would be separated from the residential area. It was noted that the restaurant had some car parking provision, however, objections had been received in relation to car parking in the vicinity and its management on the site. The proposed extension would be small and not cause any harm to residents. Members were informed that the application could not be refused due to the car parking issues and it was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to questions raised, Members were informed that:

- The extension would be constructed over a decked area and the existing parking arrangements would be retained.
- The extension would be set back from the front wall.
- The proposal would create a small dessert lounge and provide an additional 66 square metres of floor space.
- It was not considered to be a significant increase and the extension covered an existing outside seating area.

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

- He represented the residents of Summerseat Place.
- The business was expanding and no additional parking provision had been proposed.
- There were currently four car parking spaces.
- The restaurant could seat 200 people and the parking provision was not adequate.
- The proposed expansion would increase the parking issues.
- Summerseat Place did not have any off-street parking provision or footpaths.
- Customers parked in residents' driveways.
- Confrontations had occurred between the restaurant owners and residents.
- The proposal would affect the street view.
- The front of properties on the street were covered by a covenant.
- The character and the view of the street had to be maintained and it was believed that the extension would have a detrimental effect.
- The residents wanted the Council to resolve their problems.

In response to a number of the points made, the Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that covenants were private matters and planning



applications could not be refused on these grounds. In relation to the parking provision, he indicated that the increase to the size of the building was only small and a large restaurant had previously been located at the premises. The Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that residents' issues could not be dealt with as part of the planning application, as they were beyond the scope of the Planning Department and the Panel.

During the discussion Members expressed their concerns in relation to the car parking issues and indicated that the proposal would exacerbate the current situation, which would further impact on local residents. It was stated that the expansion of the business should not be to the detriment of residents and that those affected should have approached their Ward Councillor previously.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposal fails to provide sufficient off street parking within the site for customers and staff and would exacerbate the competition for parking in the vicinity. Consequently there would be increased manoeuvring and parking of vehicles within the highway to the detriment of the safe and free-flow of traffic. For this reason the proposal fails to comply with policies TM11 and TM19A of the Council's Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

**5. 6 MICKLETHWAITE DRIVE, QUEENSBURY, Queensbury
BRADFORD**

A full planning application for the construction of a first floor side extension and two storey rear extension to the property at 6 Micklethwaite Drive, Queensbury, Bradford - 16/00140/HOU

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application proposed an extension to the rear and first floor of the west side of the property, which could cause a slight overshadowing of the adjacent garden, however, this would not have a significant detriment. It was noted that the proposed extension's roof had been slightly amended in order to clear the 25 degree angle view and would not disrupt the light to other properties. Members were informed that the scheme complied with Council policies, however, it had been suggested that a restriction on permitted development rights to prevent additional windows being formed in the northwest elevation be placed on the application. The application was then recommended for approval.



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

**6. PRINCE OF WALES INN, 457 ALLERTON ROAD, BRADFORD
Thornton & Allerton**

A full retrospective planning application for the conversion of pub into restaurant with new aluminium frontage, new roof, external stairs and first floor rear extension at the former Prince of Wales Public House, 457 Allerton Road, Allerton, Bradford - 16/01813/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was a resubmission and had previously been considered by the Panel in February 2016. The previous application had proposed the conversion of one dwelling into two flats and this had been refused due to the lack of off-street parking. The scheme had been amended and now proposed the conversion of a public house to a restaurant on the ground floor with an independent residential unit on the first floor. Members were informed that the scheme could be achieved under permitted development rights and was not a material change of use. A number of objections had been received in relation to car parking and highway safety, as the site did not provide off-street parking. The land to the side of the site had previously been used as an informal car park, however, this was outside the red line boundary and had a separate planning permission. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the granting of the application would not cause highways safety or parking issues. He confirmed that the development was small scale and for the modifications only. 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 main focus of the business would be as a restaurant and the takeaway aspect would be an ancillary use. The application proposed a restaurant and further permission would be required to change the restaurant to a takeaway.
- The shop had been empty for some time.
- The new windows would be constructed from aluminium.

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



- He was speaking on behalf of the applicant.
- The application met the criteria of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- There were no other restaurants of this type on Allerton Road.
- The proposed change of use would not result in conditions significantly worse than if it was still a public house.
- The hours of operation would be restricted to 2300 hours.
- The proposed side extension would be in keeping with the building.
- The alterations to the frontage would not have a significant impact on the street scene.
- The proposal satisfied policy D1 of the Council's Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP).

The Strategic Director confirmed that a restriction to the opening hours had been suggested and a condition placed on the application, as there was a residential dwelling above the premises.

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

- No parking was provided for the restaurant and residents.
- The land to the side of the property had been used as a car park for 40 years.
- The proposal to construct retail units and flats would create more parking issues in the vicinity.
- The land was untidy.
- Highway and pedestrian safety was a major concern.
- The Council's Highways Department had not supported the previous application.
- A letter dated 12 April from the Highways Department stated that the scheme would lead to more vehicle movements and traffic issues.
- The land to the side of the property was within the blue line boundary and the Highways Department had suggested that it could be used for parking.
- At a previous meeting the applicant had been informed that if the land to the side was turned into a car park it would assist the situation.
- The advice had not been taken into consideration and was to be used for retail units and flats.
- Parking was an issue in the area and the scheme would increase the problems.
- A supermarket was due to open in the area in September and traffic would increase.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that:

- The conversion could be undertaken without planning permission



- and the application was for the approval of physical works.
- The Council had very little control over the use of the building.
 - The use of the land as a car park for 40 years was acknowledged, however, this had been an informal arrangement.
 - The proposal had to be considered under planning terms.
 - The property could open as a restaurant without permission.
 - It was understood that parking was an issue, however, there was no yellow lining so some on street parking was available.
 - A new supermarket could increase traffic initially, but in the long term it may reduce if people walked there.
 - Advice was provided and if the proposal had been a new build then car parking would have been required, however, the advice provided could not be defended.
 - It was a wide road with no parking restrictions.

In response to a further Member's question, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) could be considered, however, this could hamper residents' parking.

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

7. 1212 LEEDS ROAD, BRADFORD

Bradford Moor

A full planning application for the change of use of an existing A1 retail dress shop to an A3 restaurant at 1212 Leeds Road, Laisterdyke, Bradford - 15/07139/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 a change of use of an existing shop to a restaurant. The retail unit that was located next to an existing row of residential properties on a narrow road and cars parked on both sides. The residents had raised concerns that the proposal would create a demand for more on-street parking. Members noted that an application for a site opposite had been refused on highway safety grounds and the appeal had recently been dismissed by the Planning Inspector. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that an external flue with significant exposed ducting had been proposed and that the alterations requested by officers had not been undertaken. He stated that the plans identified a large amount of seating across two floors and there was already a parking issue in the area due to the amount of restaurants. The site was near to the junction with Sticker Lane and there was no opportunity for off-street parking. The application



was then recommended 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

8. 19 CHATSWORTH PLACE, BRADFORD

Manningham

An application for the construction of a dormer window to facilitate the conversion of the attic space to form bedroom and bathroom at 19 Chatsworth Place, Manningham, Bradford - 16/00713/HOU

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the dormer window was required to convert the attic space. Members were informed that an application for the same proposal was refused in 2011 and the subsequent appeal was also dismissed. The scheme had been assessed against the Council’s Householder Supplementary Planning Document (HSPD) and reasonable dormers were permitted, however, the proposal would be 5 metres wide and cover the entire roof. An application to install two dormers, which had been more in keeping, had been approved in 2011, but the permission had since lapsed. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the dormer on the property at the end of the row of houses had probably been built prior to 1988. He confirmed that the justification for the application was that it would benefit a disabled person who resided at the property. The Council’s Occupational Health Unit had been consulted and stated that there were alternative solutions available which did not require the installation of a large dormer window. Members noted that the large dormer would visually harm the roof and acknowledged that the Planning Inspector had supported the Council’s refusal in 2011. The application was then recommended for refusal due to the overdominance of the development.

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

- The property was not located in the conservation area.
- North Park Road was some distance away.
- The proposal would not harm the character of the area.
- The dormer windows at number 3 were the full width of the roof.
- The residents at number 3 were not disabled and the property faced onto Oak Lane.
- Her property faced Garfield Avenue.
- An application for a previous dormer window had been refused, however, her father had not been classed as disabled at that point.



- Information in relation to the medical requirements had been submitted.
- Another disabled person now lived at the property.
- Quality of life was allowed via the Human Rights Act.
- The previous dormer was smaller and refused.
- Work had not commenced on the planning permission for the installation of two dormer windows due to issues.
- Her father was now in a wheelchair and required more help.
- The property was a small back to back.
- They had been told to contact the Council's Occupational Health Unit in relation to the request for a bathroom on the ground floor.
- The Occupational Health Unit had stated that the house was too small to undertake alterations but adaptations could be provided.
- How did the Occupational Health Unit know that adaptations were suitable as they hadn't been consulted?
- The existing bathroom on the first floor was not large enough.
- Additional accommodation space was required.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Regeneration acknowledged the disability needs, however, he stated that the impact on the street scene had to be considered. The Council's HSPD permitted dormer windows, but they had to fit into the roofscape. Members were informed that the proposed dormer would be 5 metres wide and would overdominate the roof, however, a 3 metre wide dormer would be encouraged. The impact of the proposed dormer on the street scene would be significantly harmful and this view had been tested at appeal.

Members then raised queries and were informed that:

- The dormer on the property at the other end of the row was further away from the Conservation Area and did not set a precedent.
- Applications could be resubmitted without incurring costs and there were tests in relation to fees on applications. If the Panel was minded not to determine the application, it could be looked at, however, the applicant would have to be willing to negotiate. If a decision was made, the applicant could resubmit the application or appeal.
- The Council's current policy on dormer windows was now very generous compared to previous ones. The applicant had referred to disability requirements, but no evidence had been submitted.
- Occupational Health had been involved recently, however, the issue was the harm to the street scene.
- Following determination the applicant could resubmit the application or appeal the decision.
- The application had been submitted by the agent, who was fully aware of Council policies. The previous refusal had been for the same size dormer and the issues had not been addressed.



Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

9. 7 THORN AVENUE, BRADFORD

Heaton

This is a full planning application for the construction of first floor extension above an existing single storey side extension at 7 Thorn Avenue, Heaton, Bradford - 16/00851/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 a first floor extension above an existing extension. It was noted that officers were concerned about the impact on the neighbouring property, as it was at a lower level and would be detrimental on the windows at the rear. The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reason set out in the report.

The applicant’s agent was present at the meeting and stated that:

- It was a family home and the occupants were all elderly.
- The proposal would allow other family members to move in and provide support.
- The overshadowing would only affect 5 Thorn Avenue on an evening as the garden faced due south.
- The garage at Number 5 partially overshadowed the windows now.
- The garage of Number 5 would be overshadowed the most.
- The total length of the extension would be 7.5 metres.

During the discussion it was agreed that the proposal would overdominate the neighbouring property.

Resolved –

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

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration



42.2 Document "R" - relating to miscellaneous items:

1. REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(i) 1 FRENHAM DRIVE, BRADFORD Great Horton

Construction of front dormer window to the original property and a side extension with front and rear dormer windows - 15/01223/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 14 March 2016.

(ii) 11 LANGDALE AVENUE, BRADFORD Clayton & Fairweather Green

Unauthorised dormer window to the front and rear of the premises - 14/01055/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) under delegated powers authorised enforcement action on 12 April 2016.

(iii) 12 COMO GARDENS, BRADFORD Toller

Construction of rear dormer window - 15/00238/ENFCON

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 14 March 2016.

(iv) 1356 LEEDS ROAD, BRADFORD Bradford Moor

Unauthorised installation of external extraction equipment - 15/00008/ENFUNA

No action had been taken by the owner to rectify the breach of planning control and on 4 March 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(v) 16 CANFORD ROAD, BRADFORD Thornton & Allerton

Construction of a two storey side and rear extension with dormer - 15/00999/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 17 February 2016.

(vi) 2 LAPAGE STREET, BRADFORD Bradford Moor

Unauthorised single storey front extension - 16/00048/ENFUNA



The unauthorised single storey front extension remains in place and on 11 March 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(vii) **203 GREAT HORTON ROAD, BRADFORD** **City**

Unauthorised extractor flue - 15/00712/ENFUNA

On 18 April 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(viii) **203 GREAT HORTON ROAD, BRADFORD** **City**

Breach of condition 6 of planning permission 09/03283/FUL - 15/00787/ENFCON

On 14 March 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Breach of Condition Notice.

(ix) **29 HOLLYBANK ROAD, BRADFORD** **Great Horton**

Construction of a wall exceeding 1 metre in height adjacent the highway - 15/00576/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) under delegated powers authorised enforcement action on 5 April 2016.

(x) **56 ST WILFRID'S CRESCENT, BRADFORD** **Great Horton**

Construction of two storey side and rear extension, gabling of property and construction of rear dormer window - 14/00812/ENFAPP

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 14 March 2016.

(xi) **56 ST WILFRID'S CRESCENT, BRADFORD** **Great Horton**

Construction of boundary wall to front and side of property - 16/00145/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 14 March 2016.

(xii) **79 KILLINGHALL ROAD, BRADFORD** **Bradford Moor**

Unauthorised roller shutters - 15/01218/ENFUNA

On 5 April 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.



(xiii) **8 & 10 FARLEA DRIVE, BRADFORD**

Bradford Moor

Breach of condition 3 planning permission 14/02948/FUL -
13/00279/ENFAPP

On 5 April 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised
the issue of an Enforcement Notice (Breach of Condition).

(xiv) **810 LEEDS ROAD, BRADFORD**

Bradford Moor

Breach of condition 3 planning permission 14/02948/FUL -
13/00279/ENFAPP

On 5 April 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised
the issue of an Enforcement Notice (Breach of Condition).

(xv) **912-914 LEEDS ROAD, BRADFORD**

Bradford Moor

Unauthorised roller shutters - 15/00699/ENFUNA

On 9 March 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised
the issue of an Enforcement Notice

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

2. DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

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

APPEALS ALLOWED

(i) **2 IDLE ROAD, BRADFORD**

Bolton & Undercliffe

Retrospective application for construction of outbuilding –
Case No: 15/05881/HOU

Appeal Ref: 16/00017/APPHOU

(ii) **30 KILLINGHALL ROAD, BRADFORD**

Bradford Moor

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 15/00183/ENFUNA



Appeal Ref: 15/00132/APPENF

(iii) **62 ROOLEY CRESCENT, BRADFORD**

Wyke

Construction of two-storey rear extension with balcony, single-storey side extension, front bay windows with mono-pitch roof, loft conversion with new roof and front dormer windows - Case No: 15/05819/HOU

Appeal Ref: 16/00031/APPHOU

(iv) **74 KILLINGHALL ROAD, BRADFORD**

Bradford Moor

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 14/00519/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00093/APPENF

(v) **860 - 862 LEEDS ROAD, BRADFORD**

Bradford Moor

Appeal against Discontinuance Notice - Case No: 14/00765/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00047/APPDIS

(vi) **SYKE HOUSE, GREEN LANE, QUEENSBURY,
BRADFORD**

Queensbury

Change of roof profile from lean-to, to pitched with new additional windows - Case No: 15/05727/HOU

Appeal Ref: 16/00015/APPHOU

APPEALS DISMISSED

(vii) **15 & 17 COMO AVENUE, BRADFORD**

Toller

Construction of two-storey side extension, two- and single-storey rear extension and front and rear dormer windows with raising of roof height - Case No: 15/01657/HOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00153/APPFL2

(viii) **2 VICTOR STREET, HEATON, BRADFORD**

Manningham

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 15/00002/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00095/APPENF

(ix) **353 GREAT HORTON ROAD, BRADFORD**

City

Retrospective planning application for a cabin within the rear yard - Case



No: 15/01920/FUL

Appeal Ref: 15/00112/APPFL2

(x) **353 GREAT HORTON ROAD, BRADFORD** City

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 14/01127/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00117/APPENF

(xi) **434 HUDDERSFIELD ROAD, BRADFORD** Wyke

Change of use from private hire office and car tinting workshop to hand car wash including car valeting in existing building - Case No: 15/02801/FUL

Appeal Ref: 15/00131/APPFL2

(xii) **725 LEEDS ROAD, BRADFORD** Bradford Moor

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 14/01152/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00096/APPENF

(xiii) **725 LEEDS ROAD, BRADFORD** Bradford Moor

Retrospective change of use from A1 retail to A3 café (ice cream parlour) and formation of independent retail unit and installation of shop front and security shutters. - Case No: 15/02094/FUL

Appeal Ref: 15/00115/APPFL2

(xiv) **79 AIREVILLE ROAD, BRADFORD** Heaton

Construction of detached flat-roofed garage - Case No: 15/01033/CLP

Appeal Ref: 15/00125/APPCLP

(xv) **LEAVENTHORPE HALL, THORNTON ROAD, Thornton & Allerton
BRADFORD**

Appeal against - Case No: 15/00048/ENFCOU

Appeal Ref: 15/00124/APPENF

(xvi) **THE OLD WATER HOUSE, LOW LANE,
QUEENSBURY, BRADFORD** Queensbury

Construction of first floor side extension - Case No: 15/03216/HOU



Appeal Ref: 16/00004/APPHOU

APPEAL ALLOWED IN PART/PART DISMISSED

(xvii) **21 HAMPDEN STREET, BRADFORD**

Little Horton

Retrospective application for porch to front - allowed on appeal and single storey extension to rear - dismissed on appeal - Case No: 15/05124/HOU

Appeal Ref: 16/00006/APPHOU

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

3. PETITION TO NOTE

(i) **CYGNET HOSPITAL, HUDDERSFIELD ROAD, WYKE,
BRADFORD**

Wyke

The Local Planning Authority has received a petition seeking clarification on whether the development is being constructed as approved.

An inspection will be made in due course to ascertain the situation.

Ref: 16/00216/ENFAPP

Resolved –

That the petition be noted.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

Chair

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford).

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

