

## Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday, 23 August 2017 in Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.00 am  
Concluded 1.30 pm

### Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT AND INDEPENDENT
Ellis Whiteley	S Hussain Wainwright Azam Watson	Stelling

Observers: Councillor Lynda Cromie (Minute 10(d)) and Councillor Khadim Hussain (Minute 10(b))

Apologies: Councillor Gerry Barker and Councillor Mark Shaw

### Councillor S Hussain in the Chair

#### 7. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Ellis disclosed that he was a Member of the Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee.

All Members of the Panel disclosed that they had been contacted in relation to Land at Low Lane, Queensbury, Bradford (Minute 10(d)) but had not discussed the application and would approach the matter with an open mind.

**ACTION:** *City Solicitor*

#### 8. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

#### 9. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

## 10. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

The Strategic Director, Place presented **Document “C”**. Plans and photographs were displayed in respect of each application and representations summarised.

a) **3 Whetley Hill Resource Centre, Whetley Hill, Manningham  
Bradford**

A full planning application for the change of use of the existing building from use class D1 to class B1 and B8 (offices with storage) at 3 Whetley Hill Resource Centre, Bradford - 17/02653/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was for the change of use to offices with storage at an existing building that had access from Whetley Hill and offered car parking provision along with a vehicle turning area. The conversion would be from Class D1 to B1 and B8 and the proposed use was considered to be appropriate, as the building was located in a mixed use area. There were a number of protected trees to the front of the site, which would remain and the existing access provided good visibility. A number of representations in objection and support had been received and the issues were covered in the report. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that there would not be any noise and disturbance issues, however, if Members were minded to approve the application, it was recommended that the hours of use be restricted. The access and loading had been assessed by the Council’s Highways Department and would not have any highway safety implications. Members were informed that the building was vacant and needed to be brought back into use. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and subject to the alteration of Condition 2 to restrict the hours of operation.

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

- The recommendation was clear.
- The Council had decided to sell the building and transfer the community use elsewhere.
- The building could have been purchased for community use.
- The Council’s Highways Department had not objected to the application.
- The site would not be accessed by very large trucks.
- There was a loading point on the building.
- Litter was being dumped at the site as it was empty and its use would dissuade this from occurring.
- There was no time limit on the use.
- Condition 2 would be amended to reflect the trading of the nearby shopping parade.
- The business would be selling high quality textiles.
- It would be better for the site to be used.



In response to a Member's concern regarding the operating hours, the Strategic Director, Place reported that the local centre was nearby and it had been proposed that the premises would open from 10 am. He indicated that the loading and unloading of vehicles could be conditioned, however, this would only occur once or twice per week. The amended operating hours would safeguard residential amenity and the premises would usually be closed on a Friday for prayers. Other Members stated that the proposed operating hours were reasonable and that the application would bring a vacant building back into use and create employment opportunities.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report and subject to the amendment of condition 2 as follows:**

**'The use of the premises shall be restricted to the hours from 10.00 to 20.00 Mondays to Saturdays and from 10.00 to 19.30 on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.'**

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(b) Former site of 1 Midland Road, Frizinghall, Bradford Heaton**

A full planning application for the construction of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings at the former site of 1 Midland Road, Frizinghall, Bradford - 17/00342/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that the application was for the construction of two pairs of semi-detached properties in a residential area with a variety of designs of houses. The site was untidy and adjacent to a Community Centre. It was noted that in April 2016 planning permission had been granted for the construction of two pairs of semi-detached houses and the reserved matters had been approved in November 2016. The new scheme was the same as that previously approved, except for the addition of extensions to the rear of the properties. The Strategic Director, Place explained that the permitted development rights had not been removed from the permission approved in 2016, so the houses could have been built with the extensions, however, the applicant had been informed by the Planning Department that this was not a minor change and had submitted an application. He confirmed that a number of representations had been received in objection and support that were the same as those submitted for the previous scheme, which was extant. The principle of construction had been established, the visual amenity was acceptable and the scheme would fit in with the area and street scene. Consultations had been undertaken with Council departments and West Yorkshire Police, who had not objected to the proposal and the dwellings would not overlook, be overbearing or



cause overshadowing. 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, Place reported that the existing access would be closed, as it would not be required and the traffic mitigation measures on Beamsley Road would be relocated, however, a Section 278 Agreement would have to be in place prior to any work being undertaken. He confirmed that the properties would have four bedrooms and two off street parking places per dwelling.

A Councillor in support of the applicant was present at the meeting and stated that:

- The application should be approved.
- The initial application had been granted and the scheme could have been constructed.
- Some of the objections were unfounded.
- The development complied with Council policies.
- Adequate parking would be provided.
- The houses would be clear of the Community Centre's fire exit.

**Resolved –**

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

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(c) Land at Grid Ref 414395 436265 Wilmer Drive, Shipley, Heaton Bradford**

Full planning permission for construction of 5 bedroom detached dwelling at Land at Grid Ref 414395 436265 Wilmer Drive, Shipley - 17/01157/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was for the construction of a five bedroom property on a site that in the past had been used to store containers and had now been cleared, with access gained via a track from Red Beck Vale. There were no protected trees on the site and the materials to be used would be suitable for the area. Members were informed that a number of representations had been received, including one from a Ward Councillor and the issues raised were covered in the report. The scheme would be visually acceptable and the facing distances were appropriate. The Strategic Director, Place reported that in relation to highway safety, garages had previously been located on the site so there would have been vehicular movements and one property would not be detrimental to highway safety. He confirmed that the site was located in Flood Risk Zone 1, which was the least likely risk and recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in



the report.

In response to a Member's query about the right of way, the Strategic Director, Place explained that there were garages on the site previously and the vehicle movements would be similar or less, therefore, it was not fair to place the burden on the developer to improve the access track to an adoptable standard.

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

- The track was the only access for properties on Red Beck Vale.
- His title deeds stated he had unrestricted access.
- The track would have to be dug up to allow services to reach the property.
- Access issues would be detrimental to his business.
- The application should be refused.
- Legal letters would be ignored if the scheme was approved.
- The information had been sent to planning officers.

Another objector was at the meeting and made the following points:

- He had purchased his property and extra land for privacy reasons.
- He was unsure if the owner had a right to sell the land and it had not been offered to him or his neighbours.
- The garages had not been used since he had lived there.
- The house would be three storey and overlook his property.
- Trees had been felled and his property was no longer private.
- The females in his household would not go out into the rear garden as it was no longer private.
- The fence would not provide privacy due to its siting.
- Two parking spaces would not be sufficient for a five bedroom property.
- The flooding and erosion of the banking was an issue.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Place explained that:

- Any issues regarding the title deeds were a private legal matter.
- The track was a public right of way and must be unrestricted, if blocked it would be a police issue.
- There would not be any habitable room windows to the south and this could be conditioned.
- Condition 8 on the application removed the Permitted Development Rights.

A Member queried whether water had overtopped the banking onto gardens. An objector confirmed that this had occurred and that water had flooded onto the road. Members were informed that the site was in Flood Zone 1 and there were no drainage issues. It was then questioned whether a condition could be placed on the application and the Strategic Director, Place stated that it could if Members were minded to approve the application.



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

- The proposal was for a family dwelling on a brownfield site.
- The site had previously been used for storage.
- The track provided access and the dwelling would not cause an intensification of its use.
- Windows would not overlook neighbours' gardens.
- No protected trees would be affected.
- The Heaton Woods Trust had removed the trees.
- Permeable materials would be used for the hard standing area.
- Rain water would be re-used.
- The design would accord and match with local dwellings.
- The development would not overlook other properties and had not resulted in the loss of trees.
- A sustainable drainage (SuDs) system and solar panels would be installed.
- The scheme complied with Council policies.
- The application should be supported.

In response to a Member's queries regarding the drainage, the applicant's agent explained that discussions would be undertaken with Yorkshire Water in order to agree how much water could be retained on the site and the flow rate. He confirmed that there was a separate drainage system on the site and the water would flow into this system. The Strategic Director, Place indicated that the condition placed on the application in relation to the drainage would ensure that consultations would be undertaken with Yorkshire Water and the development would not be able to commence until all parties were satisfied.

Another Member stated that he did not believe it was unreasonable to make the track up to the Council's adoptable standard, however, the Strategic Director, Place replied that it would be unreasonable to place the burden on one person when it was under multiple ownership. He confirmed that the Council's Highways Department had not objected to the proposal and stated that there would be adequate access.

During the discussion a Member acknowledged that access issues were a civil matter and could not be considered by the Panel. He then suggested that the drainage condition be amended to include consultation with Yorkshire Water and that a combined sewer would not be used. In response the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that information would be requested irrespective of previous dialogues undertaken and the condition would cover the points raised.

**Resolved –**

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

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***



**(d) Land at Low Lane, Queensbury, Bradford**

**Queensbury**

A retrospective application for the change of use of land to a gypsy and traveller caravan site at Land at Low Lane, Queensbury - 17/01223/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that it was a retrospective application for the change of use of land located in the Green Belt. A number of representations in objection and support had been submitted including a late submission opposing the proposal from a Ward Councillor and a letter from the Parish Council's Planning Committee requesting that a site visit be undertaken. All the issues raised had been covered in the report. It was noted that the application had been submitted some time ago and there had been amendments to the Council's policy HO12 since the adoption of the Core Strategy on 18 July 2017. The Strategic Director, Place reported that the use had commenced and consisted of a static caravan and a touring caravan on the site, which was occupied by a family with five children under the age of 14 years and was located in the Green Belt. He indicated that Members needed to consider the significant harm to the Green Belt against the special circumstances submitted. The Council had recently lost a similar appeal and the resulting protocol had been followed. It was reiterated that five children of school age lived in the caravan, which was sited in a sustainable location and this had been considered as special circumstances to allow temporary planning permission, along with the restoration of the site after four years. The Strategic Director, Place then recommended the application for temporary approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that:

- There were five children under 14 years and six children in total.
- The children attended a local school.
- Access to the site was considered as acceptable, as Queensbury was a walkable distance and it was a sustainable location.
- The driveway on the site was made from crushed stone and had been installed within the last 12 months.
- The caravan was located next to a stable block and there were stone built houses behind the trees.
- Special circumstances had been accepted and it would be a temporary situation.

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

- The site was located within the Green Belt.
- It was not in keeping with the area.
- The application was setting a precedent that land could be bought and caravans erected.
- It was believed that there would be more similar applications.
- The Council should not have allowed the situation to occur within the Green Belt.



- The caravan should have to be removed immediately.

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

- He was the immediate neighbour of the site.
- He lived in a historic stone house.
- Over 200 objections had been submitted, though some were xenophobic.
- The large solid wooden fence and the CCTV system made the site look like a fortress.
- It was not in keeping with the Green Belt.
- The application was entirely dependant on the special circumstances of the children.
- It had not been possible to find out the children's circumstances.
- The shortfall of Gypsy and Traveller sites in Bradford had been used to favour the granting of planning permission.
- The Council's policy stated that Green Belt land was an exception for the use for Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- It was believed that the applicant and her family had previously lived in a house and this would have been a stable environment.
- A site visit should be undertaken in order to see the impact of the fence.

In response to a Member's question, the applicant confirmed that the children attended Stocks Lane Primary and Queensbury School. The Strategic Director, Place clarified that the application was for a single caravan for one family with children. He stated that each application was considered on its own merits, however, the recent appeal decision had to be taken into account. The site was located in the Green Belt and similar conditions had been attached to the application. The City Solicitor informed Members that there was a strong body of case law where children were involved and considerable weight should be given to school age children in order to provide them with stability and an education. These special circumstances then needed to be compared to the harm on the Green Belt. A Member reported that the objector had stated that the family had previously lived in a house and the City Solicitor explained that it was difficult to define a person of nomadic habit in life. He confirmed that the person could still retain the gypsy or traveller title but could remain stable, as they may go back to a nomadic lifestyle.

Members raised further queries and the Strategic Director, Place reported that:

- The recent appeal decision had granted permission for five years, however, the recommendation for this application was four years, as the application had been submitted some time ago and the timescale was in line with the schedule for gypsy and traveller sites.
- The permission would be temporary and a condition had been placed on the application that the land had to be restored, which would control the impact on the Green Belt.
- It was hoped that the Council would have allocated gypsy and traveller sites within four years and it was acknowledged that the children may be disrupted at this point. It was accepted that the site was visually





inappropriate, however, it was a finely balanced decision and if the Council had a five year land supply the application would have been recommended for refusal. Therefore it was hoped that there would be an available site within four years, if not sooner.

- It could not be confirmed what the applicant's intentions were in relation to remaining in the area, as all the details had been agreed with the agent.
- The permission would be for a four year period and the applicant would have to reapply if the Council's site was not available.
- It was agreed that the proposal was not acceptable in the Green Belt.
- The application had been considered on its own merits, the conditions applied were similar to those based on the Planning Inspector's comments and it had been submitted due to the Council's five year land shortage.
- Vacancies on other traveller sites varied due to the habits and lifestyles of gypsies.

Members then questioned the applicant, who confirmed that:

- The land had been purchased around May 2015.
- She wanted her children to be educated, as they had always attended school, but they would still travel. The family had moved in August 2016, as there had been a social media campaign against them and they wanted to fit in with the community.
- They wanted to remain in the area and have somewhere to call home.
- They had lived in a house over three years ago, but had not liked it.

The Strategic Director, Place explained that it was anticipated that there would be provision for gypsy and travellers in the next four years and confirmed that the planning permission would only last four years. The merits of the case had been assessed and based upon the stability of the children, who may be disrupted at that time as it was not known where the site would be located. What may or may not happen could not be predicted. It was acknowledged that the application did not comply with Green Belt policies and the merits had been based upon the special circumstances of the family. The City Solicitor confirmed that the application did not stop the family being of nomadic habit and if they remained on the site, the special circumstances would still apply unless there was an intention for the family not to return to a nomadic lifestyle.

During the discussion Members acknowledged that the children required a permanent base, however, they expressed their concerns in relation to the visual harm the site had on the Green Belt and suggested that the permission be granted for three years. Other Members indicated that they believed the site looked permanent and the family had no intention of resuming their nomadic lifestyle. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that at the end of the permission the Council would contact the applicant and they would have to submit another planning application if they wanted to remain on the site, otherwise enforcement action would be undertaken. A Member stated that the site was inappropriate in the Green Belt and another indicated that if there had been natural screening instead of a fence, gates and CCTV then it would not have had such an impact on the area.



**Resolved –**

**That the application be refused for the following reason:**

**That the development is inappropriate within the Green Belt and the very special circumstances put forward are not considered to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies GB1 and GB2 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and guidance contained within the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(e) Land South of 15 Rose Mount, Bradford Bolton and Undercliffe**

Construction of two-storey dwelling and new off road parking on land south of 15 Rose Mount, Bradford - 17/03390/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that it was a vacant site and the proposed house had been designed to have minimum impact on the neighbouring property. There would not be any habitable windows to the side elevations and the parking provision would be accessed from Rose Mount. The site was in a sustainable location within a residential area and the development would be an appropriate size, scale and design. The separation distances complied with Council standards and two car parking spaces would be provided. The Strategic Director, Place stated that a number of representations had been received and the issues were covered in the officer's report. He then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that:

- Two parking spaces had been provided, but three could be accommodated.
- There would not be a requirement to park on the road as off-street parking had been provided.
- There was the potential to provide three parking spaces on the site and if the occupiers required more spaces they would have to park like other residents.
- The parking provision complied with the Council's standard.

**Resolved –**

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



**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

**(f) New Line Retail Park, Bradford**

**Idle and Thackley**

A Regulation 3 application for the closure of the existing access to New Line Retail Park from New Line and to amend the existing access to a Nursery and New Works Units A & B from New Line to include access to New Line Retail Park. Removal of external walls to 70 New Line between existing columns on the west elevation to form new openings to accommodate 4 car parking spaces and a replacement bin store - 17/03441/REG

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed that access to the New Line Retail Park was amended to be via the existing access used by the light industrial units and a Nursery. The junction of New Line and Harrogate Road was an issue for the Council and a major redevelopment scheme of the junction had already been approved. The proposal allowed for the widening of the carriageway. It was noted that objections had been submitted and the issues were covered in the officer's report. The Strategic Director, Place informed Members that the Council's Highways Department had originally raised concerns in relation to the access for refuse vehicles, however, amended plans had been submitted that were acceptable. He reported that there were currently 18 car parking spaces for seven units and the scheme would result in the provision of 16 spaces for six units. Concerns had also been raised in relation to the access point being located where two lanes would merge on the road. In conclusion the Strategic Director, Place recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to a Member's query, the Strategic Director, Place explained that the proposal would tie in with the junction of Harrogate Road and New Line, the speed limit was 30 miles per hour and it was light controlled. He confirmed that the purpose was to allow vehicles to merge into one lane over a longer stretch of road.

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

- It was a nightmare junction.
- Planning permission had had been granted in relation to the alterations.
- New Line Retail Park was a busy block of shops.
- The car park was frequently used.
- It was proposed that 70 New Line would become part of the car park.
- There was a new tenant in 70 New Line.
- The entrance would be located next to the access to the busy children's nursery.
- He had witnessed children running across the car park to the nursery.
- Six of the businesses had deliveries and all had bins.
- The eighth car park space could not realistically be used.
- The disabled car park space was tight.



- He did not believe that a survey had been undertaken on the use of the retail park by vehicles.
- It was extremely dangerous.
- The junction needed filter lights.
- The application should be deferred in order for a better scheme to be submitted that would not endanger children.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that the junction scheme had been approved in April 2017. He stated that all the issues raised had been considered and an amended scheme had been submitted following concerns raised in relation to the access and the disabled parking space. The levels of parking would also be reduced.

The Strategic Director, Place explained that the application was required as it was part of the junction improvement scheme. The alignment removed parking spaces from the retail park and it would be accessed from the improved road.

**Resolved –**

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

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

**(g) 12 Melbourne Grove, Bradford**

**Bradford Moor**

Construction of larger porch than previously approved under application 15/06667/HOU at 12 Melbourne Grove, Bradford - 17/03336/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application requested the retention of a larger porch than previously approved, which had been built in 2015 without planning permission and did not comply with Council policies. A previous application to retain and alter the existing porch had been approved, however, the application for consideration proposed the retention of the existing structure. Members were informed that planning permission had been granted for a smaller porch and that Enforcement Action had been entered into. A subsequent appeal had been dismissed in December 2016 and the applicant had been allowed 3 months to demolish the building, however, the issue had not been resolved 8 months later. A Ward Councillor had then requested that the application be submitted to the Panel. The Strategic Director, Place recommended the application for refusal as per the reasons set out in the officer’s report.

In response to a query regarding the statement from the Ward Councillor that there were similar porches in the area that had been granted planning permission, the Strategic Director, Place stated that no locations had been provided and there were no porches in the vicinity. He confirmed that the applicant could build a porch 3 metres long under permitted development rights.



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

- This was the third application that had been submitted in relation to the porch.
- Planning officers had been contacted.
- It was unclear what planning permission had to be complied with.
- Feedback from the Planning Department had not been received.
- The applicant had complied with what had been requested.
- A slate roof and render had been used as requested.
- The local MP had been contacted as no progress had been made.

In response the Strategic Director, Place explained that the Planning Department would have sent a letter on receipt of each application. He confirmed that the structure had been built without permission and the Enforcement Officer had been in contact with the applicant. The applicant had continually requested further time and the issue had not progressed. An appeal against the Enforcement Notice had been submitted and dismissed, however, the applicant had not complied with the request to remove the porch.

The applicant's representative stated that the requests had been adhered to and the porch had been reduced from 18 to 14 foot. The Strategic Director, Place informed the Panel that meetings had taken place with the MP's representative and that there was extant planning permission for a porch at the property. He reiterated that an Enforcement Notice had been served, the subsequent appeal against the notice had been dismissed and this had resulted in the applicant being given 3 months to remove the structure. It was noted that planning permission had previously been granted and the application under consideration related to the structure that had been built and not what had been approved.

During the discussion a Member stated that the submitted application had been recommended for refusal and the applicant could either build the porch as previously approved or remove the structure.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be refused as per the reason set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report.**

***Action: Strategic Director, Place***

## 11. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

The Strategic Director, Place presented **Document "D"** and the Panel noted the following:

### **REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION**



**(a) 124 Allerton Road, Bradford** **Toller**

Unauthorised mixed use of land for residential use, the storage and preparation of vehicles for sale and the sale and supply of motor vehicles - 17/00016/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 28 June 2017.

**(b) 130 Jesmond Avenue, Bradford** **Toller**

Unauthorised mixed residential and religious teaching studies use - 16/00111/ENFUNA

On 27 June 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice in respect of the unauthorised mixed use of the property.

**(c) 15 Ennerdale Road, Bradford** **Bolton and Undercliffe**

Unauthorised dormer windows and rear extension - 16/00851/ENFAPP

On 28 March 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(d) 16 Lodore Avenue, Bradford** **Bolton and Undercliffe**

Unauthorised front and rear dormer windows - 16/01146/ENFUNA

On 29 March 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(e) 223 Burnsall Road, Bradford** **Bradford Moor**

Unauthorised structure - 14/00347/ENFUNA

On 20 June 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(f) 40 Post Office Road, Bradford** **Eccleshill**

Unauthorised fence and gate - 17/00011/ENFUNA

On 7 April 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(g) 451 Toller Lane, Bradford** **Heaton**

Unauthorised structure and means of enclosure - 17/00532/ENFUNA



On 20 June 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(h) 6 Ruswarp Crescent, Bradford Eccleshill**

Breach of condition 2 of planning permission 01/01072/COU - 17/00008/ENFCO

On 27 June 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Breach of Condition Notice in the interests of residential amenity for local residents.

**(i) 92- 96 Lapage Street, Bradford Bradford Moor**

Unauthorised alterations - 16/00676/ENFAPP

On 30 March 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(j) BMS House, Thornton Road, Bradford Manningham**

Unauthorised mixed use comprising:

The sale, supply and storage of motor vehicles and MOT testing, repairing, servicing and valeting of motor vehicles - 16/00017/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 26 July 2017.

**(k) Connaught Rooms, 32-36 Manningham Lane, Bradford City**

Unauthorised roller shutters and signage - 17/00266/ENFLBC

On 3 April 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

**(l) Land at Delph Farm, Holts Lane, Clayton, Bradford Clayton and Fairweather Green**

Change of use of land consisting of the provision of land for the exercising and training of dogs - 16/00129/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 11 April 2017.

**(m) Land rear of 40-44 Oak Lane, Back St Marys Road, Manningham  
Bradford**

Breach of conditions 4 and 5 planning permission 07/01035/FUL -



16/00908/ENFAPP

On 29 March 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice (Breach of Condition).

**(n) Land South of 607 Great Horton Road, Bradford Great Horton**

Unauthorised use of land for skip hire depot and waste transfer site -  
17/00207/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 19 June 2017.

**DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

***APPEALS ALLOWED***

**(o) 32 Bromford Road, Bradford Bowling and Barkerend**

Construction of side and rear extension - Case No: 16/09493/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00065/APPHOU

**(p) 6 Thurley Road, Bradford Bowling and Barkerend**

Retrospective application for construction of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer window - Case No: 17/00634/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00058/APPHOU

**(q) The Leisure Exchange, Vicar Lane, Bradford City**

Freestanding 48 sheet LED advertising unit - Case No: 17/00208/ADV

Appeal Ref: 17/00059/APPAD1

***APPEALS DISMISSED***

**(r) 12 Whitby Terrace, Bradford Toller**

Construction of two storey side and rear extension - Case No: 16/09478/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00027/APPHOU

**(s) 148 Wilmer Road, Bradford Heaton**

Dormer windows to front and rear - Case No: 17/00643/HOU





Appeal Ref: 17/00053/APPHOU

**(t) 19 Shay Drive, Bradford**

**Heaton**

Hip to gable roof and construction of dormer windows to front and rear - Case No: 16/09063/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00055/APPHOU

**(u) 353 Great Horton Road, Bradford**

**City**

Removal of existing cabin and construction of single storey side and rear extension. - Case No: 16/09426/FUL

Appeal Ref: 17/00035/APPNO2

**(v) 4 Park Square, Bradford**

**Royds**

Change of use of dwelling to mixed use of residential and childminding care business - Case No: 16/06578/FUL

Appeal Ref: 17/00042/APPFL2

**(w) 72 Ashbourne Way, Bradford**

**Bolton and Undercliffe**

Construction of single storey rear extension - Case No: 17/00533/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00070/APPHOU

**(x) 8 Waverley Road, Bradford**

**City**

Construction of single storey rear extension to accommodate disabled facilities - Case No: 16/08981/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00028/APPHOU

**(y) Field House, Cockin Lane, Bradford**

**Queensbury**

Segregation of land to create new drive-way from Cockin Lane - Case No: 16/07430/FUL

Appeal Ref: 17/00011/APPHOU

**Resolved –**

**That the decisions be noted.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**



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

