

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday, 20 July 2016 at Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.05 am
Concluded 12.10 pm

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
Rickard	Lee Wainwright Amran	Stelling

Observers: Councillor Paul Cromie (Minute 5(h)), Councillor Beverley Mullaney (Minute 5(a) and (i)) and Councillor Mohammad Shabbir (Minute 5(b) and (c))

Apologies: Councillor Nazam Azam and Councillor Mark Shaw

Councillor Lee in the Chair

1. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Amran was acquainted with the applicant and agent in relation to Minute 5(b) and (c) and he therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of these items 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 Wainwright had been informed of but had not discussed the complaint in respect of Minute 6(b) and had passed it to another Ward Councillor to resolve.

Action: *City Solicitor*

2. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2016 be signed as a correct record.



3. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

5. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration presented **Document "A"**. Plans and photographs were displayed in respect of each application and representations summarised.

(a) **11 Rudding Avenue, Bradford**

Thornton & Allerton

Two-storey side and single-storey rear extension, 11 Rudding Avenue, Allerton, Bradford - 16/02699/HOU

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 two storey side and single storey rear extension. A number of objections had been submitted and additional representations had been received following the publication of the report. The Council's Highways Department had also put forward a late consultation response that stated the scheme would require three car parking spaces. It was noted that the Council's Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) required two spaces for such a property, however, other policies were being looked at that were more generous with regard to parking provision. Members were informed that the extension would be the standard 3 metres in depth and be set back from the front. There would not be any visual amenity, overshadowing or overbearing issues and the proposal fully complied with Council policies. A condition to remove permitted development rights for the installation of further windows in the property had been placed on the application. It was noted that the scheme would maintain the two required parking spaces at the side of the property and that an additional provision could be created at the front of the house. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the application was fully compliant with the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (HSPD) and recommended it for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to query as to whether it was an open plan estate, the Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that this would be controlled through the title deeds and confirmed that the removal of the lawn would be covered under permitted development rights. He clarified that the parking provision would not alter and there were other areas that could be used. It was also noted that the street was not subject to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) or yellow lines.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and explained that the proposal



would provide accommodation for the applicant's elderly parents and enable them to be cared for.

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) & (c) 14 Crow Tree Lane, Bradford

Toller

- (b) A retrospective application seeking listed building consent for the installation of security gates and related equipment at 14 Crow Tree Lane, Daisy Hill, Bradford - 16/03494/LBC
- (c) A retrospective planning application for the installation of security gates and related equipment to the access of 14 Crow Tree Lane, Daisy Hill, Bradford - 16/03496/HOU

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was retrospective for the retention of security gates to the driveway of the grade II listed buildings. The main issue was the location of the control mechanism and an objection to the proposal had also been received from a neighbour in relation to the access. Members were informed that the application had been revised to relocate the ancillary equipment to within the applicant's land and this was acceptable. The proposal was then recommended for approval.

In response to Members' queries, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the neighbours affected had been provided with access codes and there was a key pad on both sides of the gate.

A Councillor was present at the meeting in support of the applicant and stated that all the issues and objections had now been addressed.

Resolved –

(b) & (c) 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) 28 Escroft Close, Wyke, Bradford

Wyke

A full application for the construction of a detached bungalow at land to the side of No.28 Escroft Close, Wyke, Bradford - 16/02499/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 bungalow on garden land and a previous scheme for a dormer bungalow had been refused due to the size. It was noted that the amended development had been reduced in size and would be set back. Several representations had been received and a Ward Councillor had requested that the application be considered by the Panel. The site was located in a residential area and the property would not cause any overlooking or overshadowing issues. The scheme included car parking and a turning provision with access from the existing estate. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to a query regarding the shared access, the Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that the proposed scheme would work.

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) 387 Little Horton Lane, Bradford

Little Horton

A retrospective planning application for the construction of a two storey side and rear extension to an existing A1 retail unit at 387 Little Horton Lane, Bradford - 16/01575/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that the application was retrospective, as the extension had already been built and there was a history of unauthorised development on the site, some of which had been resolved. The access to the site was narrow from Stowell Mill Street and had a poor junction with Little Horton Lane, which had restricted visibility. The application had initially proposed the sale of hot food, however, this aspect had now been removed and the extension would be ancillary to the existing use. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that the existing car park would be retained and suggested that condition 3 be amended to state that it be used by customers of the premises. He then recommended that the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report and the proposed amendment.

A Member questioned whether the litter on the car park could be dealt with and



was informed that this was a matter for the Council's Environmental Health Department.

The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and confirmed that the application complied with Council policies. He indicated that the two storey extension matched the existing building and offered the applicant retail space to assist with his business.

The Chair stated that applicant should abide by planning laws and noted that the Council had clamped down on retrospective applications. It was also suggested that the litter and rubbish be removed from the car park.

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 subject to the amendment of condition 3 as follows:

The car parking spaces shown on approved plan numbered SR-1690-2 shall be kept available for use by customers of businesses within the building known as 387 Little Horton Lane.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policies TM2 and TM11 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration

(f) Land South of Hill Top Road, Thornton, Bradford Thornton & Allerton

An outline application for the construction of five residential units on land to the south of Hill Top Road, Thornton - 16/00468/OUT

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application was outline for the construction of five residential units on allocated housing land that was owned by the Council. There was an existing public footpath, which the proposed access would run alongside and the mature trees on the boundary with the cemetery would be retained. The whole of the larger allocated housing site was owned by three separate organisations. Levels dropped significantly across the site and so the land would be retained in order to maintain an acceptable gradient. The Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that only the access was being considered and this demonstrated that the site could be developed. He confirmed that a number of representations had been submitted and further information had been received in relation to drainage, which indicated that a Sustainable Urban Drainage system (SUDs) was not suitable. It was also noted that other access points had been investigated, however, they were not acceptable. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the



conditions as set out in the report and the addition of an additional condition regarding heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements.

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

- Concerns had been raised regarding the drainage.
- Close Head Lane would be vulnerable.
- Unsubstantial drainage details had been provided.
- The 2005 Regulations stated that a SUDs was required in order to mimic the natural drainage.
- Surface water drainage proposals should have a neutral effect.
- The application should not be granted unless the drainage provision was adequate.
- A comprehensive drainage assessment was required.
- It was not known if there were any culverts in the area.
- Building should be done on brownfield sites before using greenfield.
- Walkers and horse riders frequently used the pathway.
- The natural beauty should be retained.
- Which trees would be removed?

In response to number of points raised it was reiterated that the application was outline and other issues would be discussed at the reserved matters stage. It was confirmed that a drainage condition had been placed on the application, the regulations quoted only applied to Scotland and the site was allocated for housing.

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 subject to the following additional condition:

- (i) **Before any work begins on site a method statement relating to the preparation of the site for development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This statement should include details of the volume of material to be removed, the number of associated HGV movements, the hours in which these movements would take place and mitigation measures to deal with noise, dust and vibration. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In the interest of amenities of nearby residential properties and highway safety and to comply with Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration



**(g) Queensbury Reservoir, Glazier Road, Queensbury, Queensbury
Bradford**

A full application for the demolition of derelict water storage tanks and construction of five four-bed dwellings and associated access at Queensbury Reservoir, Glazier Road, Queensbury, Bradford - 16/02041/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He confirmed that the application proposed the demolition of water storage tanks, which were located in the Green Belt and the widening of the access road. It was noted that the ownership of Glazier Road had been questioned, however, the applicant had confirmed that it was unregistered and had completed Certificate B on the application form. Members were informed that the access road would be widened into the field, however, issues remained as a wall obscured the view on the blind bend of the main road. The access road would be surveyed before and after the construction period in order for any damages to be rectified. The visibility splays would also be improved and widened and a footpath would be installed. The Strategic Director, Regeneration stated that the protected trees would not be affected and the metal fence would be removed and replaced with one more appropriate. He explained that the proposed properties would be set into the ground and not exceed the current height of the water tanks. The houses were well designed and would be located in an appropriate setting within the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) permitted the re-use of such sites and the proposal would be an improvement of an unattractive area. The Strategic Director, Regeneration concluded that the application was the best scheme for the site and recommended it for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

Members were informed that the representations submitted had all referred to the use of the road.

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

- There was confusion in relation to the status.
- Yorkshire Water had confirmed that it was a private road and the Council had stated it was a public footpath with residents being responsible for half of the road and the resurfacing.
- The Council had now said it was a private road.
- The road was half private and would not be able to be used for the proposed development.
- Vehicles would have to reverse out of the site or on to the main road.
- Five dwellings was the limit on private drives and there would be ten.
- There were highway safety issues.
- Drawings had not been provided.
- The first part of the road was to be improved, but who would maintain it?
- A turning point would be provided at the widest point in the road, but overall the width was not adequate.
- What was the result of the dilapidation survey?
- One of the masts omitted 'microwaves'. Had a survey been undertaken?



- It was Green Belt land.
- A resident of Glazier Road had been refused planning permission for an extension.
- Residents of Little Lane had objected as they used the road for access.
- There was a clause in the contract to contribute to the up keep of the road.
- The notification letter had been received on Friday, which did not provide seven days notice of the meeting.

The City Solicitor clarified that usually residents on either side of the road would own up to the midway line, however, as nothing was registered it could be assumed that the properties fronting the road owned it and the public would have had a right to use it. The Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that as a footpath pedestrians had a right of use. He explained that the term 'unadopted' meant that the Council would not maintain the road and the current owners of the storage towers had a private right to access.

With regard to the notification letter, the City Solicitor stated that the Planning Protocol aimed for seven days notice and it was noted that there had been occasions when late notice had been given. He informed Members that the application had to be considered in accordance with planning policies and that the road rights were a private matter.

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) The Village Public House, High Street, Queensbury, Queensbury Bradford

A full planning application for the change of use of the former Village public house, High Street Queensbury from a drinking establishment to a day nursery. The application includes two modest rear extensions, new windows, a new roof and new boundary treatment - 16/03218/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that the building had been a public house, which was now empty and the application proposed its conversion to a day nursery. Representations in objection and support of the scheme had been received and the issues were covered in the officer's report. It was noted that the premise was located in the centre of Queensbury in a sustainable location and would continue the community based use when converted to a day nursery. The building could be altered under permitted development rights to a restaurant or offices that could be used 24 hours and have a more harmful effect. Members were informed that the property was in a conservation area, but was not listed and the proposed extension to the



rear would be modest and match the original. The hours of operation would be from 0730 to 1830 hours and these could be controlled by a condition on the application. The Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that a new stone boundary wall would be constructed to the front and the rear would be enclosed by a mesh fence with a green finish. He reported that revised plans had been submitted in order to take into account concerns raised and 11 off street parking places would now be provided, which would be sufficient for staff and parent drop off. A bus stop was also located directly outside. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reiterated that permitted development uses of the building could be more intensive and then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and an additional condition in respect of the boundary treatment.

A Member queried what objections had been submitted and was informed that issues in respect of noise, disturbance and traffic had been raised, however, it was noted that the premises used to be a public house and that use would have been more harmful to residential amenity.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and commented that:

- Ward Councillors were excited by the proposal.
- It would form part of the regeneration of High Street.
- The scheme would provide jobs and a facility for parents.
- The applicant had other nurseries and all were Ofsted approved.
- It had been believed that all the issues had been resolved.
- The application would hopefully be approved and the building brought back into use.

An objector was present at the meeting and stated that:

- He was a consultant acting on behalf of an objector.
- Concerns had been raised in relation to the level of parking.
- The proposal would impact upon the estate agents as they shared the existing car park.
- The layout would be detrimental.
- The details of the traffic survey undertaken at a comparable site were not publically available.

In response to the points raised, the Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that traffic volumes were looked at locally and the applicant had been asked to undertake a survey. The Council's Highways Department was satisfied in respect of the number of trips and did not believe that there would be any highway safety issues. The site was in the centre of Queensbury and the existing car park would be retained.

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

- She had lived in Queensbury since 1975.
- There was no pre or after school care in the area.



- She operated two nurseries.
- Local people needed to get back to work.
- The facility would benefit the local community.
- Queensbury needed to be regenerated.
- Objections had been received from a neighbouring nursery.
- Next year the Government would be giving parents 30 hours free childcare.
- Currently there were not enough nursery places.
- Childcare issues in Queensbury needed to be resolved.

During the discussion Members acknowledged the benefits of bringing a derelict building back into use and the requirement for childcare places in the area. An additional condition regarding the boundary treatment was also suggested.

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 subject to the following additional condition:

- (i) **Before development commences on site, details of the position, height, design, materials, and their final finish, of all boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatments so approved shall then be installed in full and retained whilst ever the use hereby permitted subsists.**

Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration

- (i) **Wellington Hotel, 395 Thornton Road, Thornton & Allerton
Thornton, Bradford**

A full application for the change of use of an existing public house with accommodation to a single dwelling at The Wellington Hotel, 395 Thornton Road, Thornton, Bradford - 16/03428/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 was for a change of use to a residential dwelling and there was already accommodation above the public house. The property was in a conservation area, but was not listed and there was no off street parking provision, though it did have a rear yard. A number of representations had been received in support and against the scheme and further objections had been submitted following the publication of the report. It was noted that the consultation with the Council’s Highways Department had acknowledged that there was no parking provision, but took into account that the property had been a public house with residential accommodation above. The Council’s Conservation officer had commented that the development would secure the building in the long term. The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the premise was located



in a sustainable position, the building would be maintained and no external alterations would be undertaken. He confirmed that residential amenity would not be affected, as no additional windows or extensions had been proposed and there were no highway safety issues, as the use would be less intense. The application was then recommended for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director, Regeneration confirmed that he was not aware of any parking issues from when the property had been a public house

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and raised the following concerns:

- Thornton was an old village.
- The property was on the main road and had become an eyesore.
- The building had now been sandblasted and the roof and windows replaced.
The Council was against the installation of uPVC windows.
- There was no parking outside due to the bus stop.
- The property should be used for business purposes.

In response to some of the points raised, the Strategic Director, Regeneration clarified that the property was in a conservation area but was not listed. He explained that the building had been a public house, so was not covered by any permitted development rights and any new windows would require planning permission, however, the windows could not be controlled if it was a residential property. The use of the building as a restaurant or business would be more intense and planning approval would be required if the premise was to be used for any other purpose.

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

- He was the landlord of the public house further along Thornton Road, which used to serve the immediate vicinity.
- There was no parking provision to the front or rear of the property.
- The proposal was inappropriate and not feasible.
- Thornton was the birth place of the Bronte sisters.
- If the commercial buildings were removed there would be nothing left in Thornton.
- The building had been sandblasted and the stone roof removed and had become an eyesore.
- Since the closure of the Wellington Hotel, his turnover had decreased.
- The building should have a commercial use.
- If the property changed to residential use it would have a negative impact on Thornton.
- Over 700 homes were to be built in Thornton.
- There would not be any public facilities for the new residents.
- It was a conservation area.



- Public houses provided a community and social hub.
- The building had been a public house since 1810.
- There had been many objections to the application.

In response to further questions, the Strategic Director, Regeneration explained that the property had last been used as a public house, but was now empty. He reported that the enforcement issues were a separate action and any planning permission would have to be taken into account. It was noted that commercial matters were not planning issues and the property could be sold or re-open as a public house, even if the application was approved. The enforcement action would continue as it was a separate course of action.

During the discussion Members expressed their sympathy at the closure of the public house, however, it was acknowledged that the property had been empty for two years with no interest shown. It was noted that there had never been a car park and the building would be converted to a residential 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

(j) 81 Girdlington Road, Bradford

Toller

A new single storey extension to the front, a new shopfront in the side elevation and the addition of external roller shutters at 81 Girdlington Road, Girdlington, Bradford - 16/02035/FUL

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that approval was sought for a single storey extension similar to others on the road, which did not have planning permission and were subject to enforcement action. The extension would protrude into the streetscene and be a prominent and incongruous addition to the front of the property. The application was therefore recommended for refusal as per the reason set out in the report.

Resolved -

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

Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration



6. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

The Strategic Director, Regeneration presented **Document “B”** and the Panel noted the following:

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(a) **103 Oak Lane, Bradford** **Manningham**

Unauthorised extractor unit - 15/01094/ENFUNA

On 27 April 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(b) **11 Fieldhurst Court, Bradford** **Tong**

Unauthorised fencing and gates - 15/00645/ENFUNA

On 2 June 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(c) **179 Otley Road, Bradford** **Bowling & Barkerend**

Unauthorised siting of a static caravan - 15/01162/ENFUNA

On 22 June 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(d) **19 Elizabeth Street, Bradford** **City**

Unauthorised single storey rear extensions - 14/00411/ENFLBC

On 22 June 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

(e) **20 Rouse Fold, Bradford** **Bowling & Barkerend**

Unauthorised vehicle repairs and storage - 16/00011/ENFCOU

On 17 May 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(f) **21 Hampden Street, Bradford** **Little Horton**

Construction of rear extension - 15/00801/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 20 April 2016.



(g) 24a Rochester Street, Bradford **Bradford Moor**

Unauthorised vehicle repairs use - 12/00993/ENFCOU

On 20 June 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(h) 298 Southfield Lane, Bradford **Great Horton**

Construction of rear extension - 15/00317/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 20 April 2016.

(i) 3 Princeville Street, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised porch extension - 16/00046/ENFUNA

On 27 April 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(j) 4 Fern Terrace, Bradford **Manningham**

Construction of breeze block boundary wall atop an existing stone boundary wall - 14/00849/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 20 April 2016.

(k) 4 Whitby Road, Bradford **Toller**

Breach of condition 2 of planning permission 95/00435/COU

On 17 June 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Breach of Condition Notice.

(l) 53 Fitzroy Road, Bradford **Bradford Moor**

Unauthorised single storey front extension - 15/00346/ENFUNA

On 17 May 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(m) 79A Westfield Lane, Shipley **Windhill & Wrose**

To be reported to the Area Planning Panel (Keighley & Shipley)



(n) **8 Oakroyd Villas, North Avenue, Bradford** **Manningham**

Unauthorised car wash use and outbuilding - 16/00176/ENFCOU

On 2 June 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(o) **860-862 Leeds Road, Bradford** **Bradford Moor**

Unauthorised external cladding and extractor unit - 14/00765/ENFUNA

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

(p) **Malik House, 29 Manor Row, Bradford** **City**

Display of advertisements without Listed Building Consent -15/01198/ENFLBC

On 27 April 2016 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

Resolved –

That the decisions be noted.

Action: Strategic Director, Regeneration

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEAL ALLOWED

(q) **130-132 Paley Road, Bradford** **Bowling & Barkerend**

Change of use of ground floor of No. 130 to merge with existing ground floor of No. 132 to form shop with front extension and dormer windows at second floor - Case No: 15/06161/FUL

Appeal Ref: 16/00045/APPFL2

APPEALS DISMISSED

(r) **366 Girlington Road, Bradford** **Toller**

Change of use from shop (A1) to restaurant (A3) - Case No: 15/04216/FUL

Appeal Ref: 16/00049/APPFL2



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

Bradford Moor

Construction of extension to form a self-contained annexe to be used as ancillary accommodation in conjunction with existing dwelling - Case No: 15/07882/HOU

Appeal Ref: 16/00044/APPHOU

(t) **Lawhill Farm, Pit Lane, Thornton, Bradford**

Queensbury

Construction of detached dwelling within curtilage - Case No: 15/02755/FUL

Appeal Ref: 16/00027/APPFL2

(u) **Site at Junction of Manchester Road and
Jacob Street, Bradford**

Little Horton

Replacement of existing 96-sheet advertisement unit with new internally illuminated LED 48-sheet advertising unit - Case No: 15/05872/ADV

Appeal Ref: 16/00032/APPAD1

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 Area Planning Panel (Bradford).

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

