

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday, 13 December 2017 in the Banqueting Hall - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.10 am
Concluded 2.10 pm

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT AND INDEPENDENT
Barker Shaw	S Hussain Wainwright Azam Watson	Griffiths

Observers: Councillor Dominic Fear (Idle & Thackley), Councillor Rizwana Jamil (Bowling and Barkerend), Councillor Nussrat Mohammed (Heaton), Councillor Taj Salam (Little Horton) and Councillor David Warburton (Wyke)

Apologies: Councillor Michael Stelling

Councillor S Hussain in the Chair

23. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Azam disclosed that he had discussed the application in relation to Shearbridge Mills, Great Horton Road, Bradford (Minute 27(e)) and he therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item in accordance with the requirements of the Members' Code of Conduct (Part 4A of the Constitution) and the Members' Planning Code of Conduct (Part 4B of the Constitution).

Councillor Griffiths disclosed that the application in relation to Albion House, 11 Stockhill Road, Bradford (Minute 27(d)) was in his Ward but he had not discussed the application.

Councillor Watson disclosed that the application in relation to 59 Town Gate, Wyke, Bradford (Minute 27(b)) was in her Ward but she had not discussed the application.

ACTION: *City Solicitor*

24. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 August and 27 September 2017 be signed as a correct record.

25. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

26. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

27. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

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

(a) 28 Wensleydale Road, Bradford

Bradford Moor

Construction of single storey rear extension at 28 Wensleydale Road, Bradford - 17/06177/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the proposal was for the construction of a single storey extension to a terraced property that had been previously extended. The scheme would provide bathroom facilities for a disabled occupant and it was believed that their needs would outweigh the issues raised. It was noted that the extension was well designed and modest in scale. The Strategic Director, Place then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and informed the Panel that the application had been submitted by a Ward Councillor and would improve the quality of life for an occupant.

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

(b) 59 Town Gate, Wyke, Bradford

Wyke

A full planning application for the change of use of the building from a solicitor's office to a private hire taxi office (radio controlled) for four taxis at 59 Town Gate, Wyke - 17/04061/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application proposed a change of use from a solicitor's office to a private hire taxi office in a property that was located in a row of listed buildings. There were existing double yellow lines along the site frontage and traffic management measures were in place. Amended plans had been received and five off-street car parking spaces would now be provided, with access through Oakenshaw Court, which met the Council's requirements. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

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

- The car parking spaces would be provided within the red line boundary.
- The number of vehicles could not be conditioned, however, the Council required one parking space per vehicle or five spaces.
- There was existing car parking to the rear of the property and new spaces would be provided.
- There were double yellow lines in the area and the applicant had agreed to provide four or five car parking spaces.
- Each application had to be assessed on its own merits and the suggestion was that four vehicles would operate from the site.
- Other business in the row had their own parking provision.
- The parking was informal at the rear.
- It was accepted there would be some manoeuvring issues for a couple of the spaces, however, vehicles would have the right to park there as long as they did not cause an obstruction.

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

- There was very little parking provision in the area for visitors, residents and tenants.
- There was limited access and egress onto Clegg Street and this was not mentioned in the report.
- Local businesses caused parking issues in the area.
- The submission proposed a booking office, but other similar applications in the vicinity had caused problems.
- It was a Grade II listed building.
- The application should be refused on highway safety grounds due to the limited access and egress, it was in a conservation area and a listed building.

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

- No changes would be made to the building internally or externally.

- A footnote had been placed on the application that stated any alterations would require planning permission.
- The application had been considered on its own merits.
- There were car parking spaces at the rear of the development and on-street parking further along Town Gate.
- Clegg Street had been acknowledged, however, it was not known if it was an unadopted or private road as only adopted highways were required to be recorded as such. Other roads were only recorded as unadopted and no distinction was made as to whether it was private or unadopted.
- The parking spaces to be provided would not be detrimental to the free flow of traffic, as long as there were no obstructions.

An objector was present at the meeting and stated that the proposed site was close to her property and would cause noise and disturbance issues. There was no need for more taxi offices in the area and more than four vehicles would be present.

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

- The applicant was an established taxi operator in Huddersfield and Brighouse.
- The proposal would bring a vacant Grade II listed building back into use.
- No changes would be made to affect the listed building.
- Only four taxi vehicles would be present and five spaces had been proposed, which complied with Council standards.
- A local taxi office would help to disperse people from the area.
- The application should be approved.

During the discussion Members raised concerns in relation to the parking provision and were informed that the public had a right to pass if the land was deemed to be a highway and it would be an offence if obstructed. If the land was private, it would be a civil matter. It was accepted that two of the parking spaces provided were restrictive and those who parked there would have to ensure that the right of way was not blocked. Another Member indicated that it was unclear who was responsible for Clegg Street. The City Solicitor explained that land ownership issues were not relevant to the decision and that the provision of five car parking spaces was sufficient in accordance with Council policy. Members acknowledged these points but reiterated their concerns in relation to the parking provision.

Resolved –

That the application be refused for the following reason:

That the suggested layout of the proposed parking spaces was impractical and the scheme would, therefore, be harmful to highway safety and residential amenity due to the increased traffic volume. This would be contrary to Policies TR2 and DS5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(c) 68 Duchy Drive, Bradford

Heaton

Full Planning permission is sought for the construction of a detached dwelling within the rear garden of 68 Duchy Drive, Bradford - 17/04834/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that the application proposed the construction of a detached dwelling within the garden of the host property that would be accessed from the existing drive. A previous application for a detached dwelling had been refused on the grounds of harm to residential amenity, however, the new proposal would be sited away from the host property and reduced in height. The amended dwelling was now a true dormer bungalow and overcame the previous reasons for refusal, therefore, it was recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the report.

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

- He lived at 11 Duchy Grove.
- The proposed property would overlook his garden and he feared for the safety of his children.
- The design did not represent the area.
- Would he be able to build a house in his garden?
- Would the house remain at the proposed height?
- A guarantee that the house would not be sold on was required.

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

- It was a quarry site and there had been issues regarding subsidence which could affect other properties.
- The proposal would add to the parking problems in the Duchy area.
- It was appreciated that the applicant had worked with planning officers.
- There would still be issues in respect of light.

In response to some of the points raised the Strategic Director, Place informed Members that:

- There would not be any habitable windows in the rear elevation.
- The only windows would be at ground level and permitted development rights would be removed for windows at a higher level.
- The inhabitants or whether the property would be sold were not a planning matter.
- The parking provision would be sufficient for the existing property and the proposed development.

Members raised queries in relation to boundary treatments and the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that there already was a large hedge and the windows would be sited below its level. He added that no concerns had been highlighted in respect of quarrying, however, a footnote could be placed on the application.

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 following footnote being placed on the application:

The developer is advised to ensure the site is capable of accommodating this development taking into account alleged quarrying in the vicinity of the site.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(d) Albion House, 11 Stockhill Road, Apperley Bridge, Idle & Thackley Bradford

A full planning application for the demolition of Albion House, Stockhill Fold, Bradford and the construction of 8 dwellings comprising detached, semi-detached and terraced houses - 17/05284/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application proposed the construction of eight dwellings on a site that contained protected trees and was near to listed buildings. A previous application had been withdrawn and the proposals revised to build a detached, two semi-detached and a row of townhouses. It was noted that two parking spaces would be provided per dwelling, the access road would not be adopted and refuse would be collected from the main road, New Line. In relation to the protected trees, a condition had been placed on the application and the Council’s Tree and Conservation officers were satisfied with the proposal. The Strategic Director, Place then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

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

- The site’s boundary wall formed part of the structure of the existing building and residents were concerned.
- Stockhill Road was narrow, had double yellow lines and speed attenuation measures.
- The school on Stockhill Road had raised concerns in respect of the large vehicles using and getting access to the site.
- A condition that prevented parking on Stockhill Road was required.

In response, the Strategic Director, Place acknowledged the concerns raised in relation to the nature of Stockhill Road and confirmed that:

- A condition regarding the management of the site and the construction hours could be placed on the application.
- A condition in respect of the boundary provision and one to make good the retained wall had been placed on the application, however, the developer would require the consent of the owners of any property that would be affected.

The applicant's agent addressed the Panel and reported that:

- The existing use generated significant traffic movements.
- The construction period could be kept within the site compound.
- Neighbours would have input in relation to the boundary wall as a party wall consultant would have to be employed and an agreement made under the Party Wall Act.
- New acoustic fences would be placed along the boundary with the industrial site and the existing stone wall would be retained.

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 following additional condition:

(i) Notwithstanding the provision of Class A, Part 4 of Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any subsequent legislation, the development hereby permitted shall not be begun until a plan specifying arrangements for the management of the construction site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction plan shall include the following details:

- i) full details of the contractor's means of access to the site including measures to deal with surface water drainage;**
- ii) hours of construction work, including any works of demolition;**
- iii) hours of delivery of materials;**
- iv) location of site management offices and/or sales office;**
- v) location of materials storage compounds, loading/unloading areas and areas for construction vehicles to turn within the site;**
- vi) car parking areas for construction workers, sales staff and customers;**
- vii) the extent of and surface treatment of all temporary road accesses leading to compound/storage areas and the construction depths of these accesses, their levels and gradients;**
- viii) temporary warning and direction signing on the approaches to the site**

The construction plan details as approved shall be implemented before the development hereby permitted is begun and shall be kept in place, operated and adhered to at all times until the development is completed. In addition, no vehicles involved in the construction of the development shall enter or leave the site of the development except via the temporary road access comprised within the approved construction plan.

Reason: To ensure the provision of proper site construction facilities on the interests of highway safety and amenity of the surrounding environment and its occupants and to accord with Policy TR2 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the

National Planning Policy Framework.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(e) Shearbridge Mills, Great Horton Road, Bradford City

An application to vary condition 4 of planning permission 03/02923/COU for an 18 month temporary period to allow operation between 09:00 and 02:00 at Shearbridge Mills, Great Horton Road, Great Horton, Bradford - 17/02772/VOC

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He confirmed that the application had initially requested the variation of condition 4 to increase the closing time from 2300 to 0400 hours, however, following discussions it had been agreed that the condition be varied for an 18 month temporary period to permit operation of the business up to 0200 hours. It was noted that the Council's Environmental Health Unit still had concerns in relation to noise, disturbance and traffic movements. Members were informed that access was gained via a narrow arch in Great Horton Road and there were other business units within the complex. The arch way was one way access only and visibility was poor. The Strategic Director, Place stated that due to the residential properties in the area, the recommendation proposed an 18 month temporary permission, though it was known that the business had operated beyond its permitted hours for many years. He reported that it was believed that the Great Horton Road access was currently being used, as there were no reports of nuisance from the residents of Grantham Road. It was then requested that the temporary permission be granted, subject to compliance with the planning approval granted in 2013 regarding the one way access system.

The applicant's agent addressed the Panel and stated that:

- The business had previously operated up to 0300 hours with no complaints.
- The closing time of 2300 hours was severely detrimental to the business.
- A long standing client base had been established.
- An independent acoustic report had been undertaken and no noise issues had been identified.
- The applicant had a good relationship with neighbouring businesses.
- Local residents supported the business.
- The application should be approved.
- The planning permission should be granted permanently, not for 18 months.
- If a temporary permission was approved there would be cost implications.

The applicant was also present at the meeting and commented that:

- It was a family business.
- Issues raised by residents had been resolved.
- 'Crocodile ramps' were already present at the access and egress, however, the area was shared with other businesses.
- The ramps had been covered over, by persons unknown, but would be

uncovered.

- Parking attendants would monitor the area.
- Full planning permission was requested.

In response to points raised the Strategic Director, Place stated that archway onto Great Horton Road was used as an exit, however, officers were not comfortable with this course of action and the egress onto Grantham Road was not being used properly, therefore, permanent planning permission would not be granted. A Member questioned that if the access and egress were correctly used throughout the timeframe of the temporary permission whether the application could be reconsidered. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that a new application would need to be submitted and a noise survey undertaken. He added that if the access onto Great Horton Road had been wide enough to accommodate two way traffic, then there would not have been an issue, however, vehicles would have to leave via Grantham Road which was a residential area.

The applicant's agent informed the Panel that the business had previously been operating until 0300 hours and using the Grantham Road access without any complaints. The Strategic Director, Place concluded that the temporary permission had been proposed as it was unclear what the effect on Grantham Road residents would be.

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) 344-350 Idle Road, Bradford

Bolton & Undercliffe

A full planning application for the change of use of the building from an A1 retail unit to an A4 bar at 344-350 Idle Road, Bradford - 17/05221/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed a change of use from retail use to a micro pub. The building was located near to a row of new terraced houses and there were other residential properties in the area. Members were informed that the application was recommended for refusal due to the adverse impact on houses to the south and east and that 20 car parking spaces would be required, however, none had been provided.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

A retrospective application for the construction of decking at 40 Watty Hall Road, Wibsey, Bradford - 17/04039/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed the Panel that the application was retrospective for the construction of decking that was raised and over the existing garage. The decking itself was not an issue, however, it now extended an extra 9 metres from the back wall of the property and enabled views into the rear habitable windows of the adjoining house. It was also in an elevated and prominent position, which presented a visual harm from the service road. The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reasons set out in the report.

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

- The existing decking had been in situ for 10 years.
- He had been informed that decking could be placed over the garage and the area enclosed.
- He had not known that planning permission would be required, as the decking had been present for 10 years.
- He had contacted the Planning Department and an officer had visited.
- The existing 10 year old decking had been replaced and the new additional extended over the shed.
- The neighbour's property could be seen into from the existing decking but not from the new area.
- Ward Councillors and neighbours were in support of the application.
- All the properties were located on a hill.
- The decking could not be seen from the unadopted road.
- The decking would not affect anyone.
- The fence panels had not been present before and the inside of neighbours' properties could be viewed.

In response the Strategic Director, Place stated that the replacement of the existing decking was not an issue and would be supported, however, the additional area would be harmful to residential amenity.

Members then posed several queries and the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that:

- No objections had been received, but representations in support had been submitted from Ward Councillors and neighbours.
- Harm to residential amenity caused by the decking over the garden shed was the main issue.
- A complaint had been submitted to the Council's Enforcement Team, as the extended depth of the decking had raised concerns.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

That the raised decking would not be detrimental to the amenity or the privacy of existing and future residents and enhanced the appearance of the wider environment. It, therefore, satisfied policies DS1, DS3 and DS5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Householder Supplementary Planning Document.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(h) Land East of 125 Harewood Street, Bradford Bowling & Barkerend

Full planning permission is sought for the construction of a domestic storage building at land east of 125 Harewood Street, Bradford - 17/04388/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed the construction of a storage building on a site that was situated on a sharp bend in the road. The development was described as domestic storage, however, it would be larger than the property that it would be serving and the application was unclear in what it was proposing. Members were informed that the building would create visual amenity issues and its scale and appearance would not be appropriate. If the building was to be for commercial use there could also be loading and unloading on the bend. The Strategic Director, Place indicated that the site was located within a coal mining area and a Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report had not been submitted. He then recommended that application for refusal as per the reasons set out in the report.

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

- The proposal would be beneficial for family in the area.
- The building would be directly opposite the family home.
- The family had lived there for 30 years.
- The community had supported their purchase of the land.
- The correct use of the land would always be ensured.
- The building would be used solely by the family to store items.
- Three generations of the family lived in the house and their many possessions would be stored in the building.
- The development would improve the area.
- Fly tipping had occurred in the area previously.
- The site was allocated as open land and it was described as development land by the Council with no restrictions.
- The applicant would work with planning officers to resolve the issues surrounding the building.
- A nearby sports centre was of a similar construction.
- The building was for storage purposes only.
- There had been three garages on the land previously.

The applicant then addressed the Panel and raised the following points:

- He knew the area very well.
- No objections had been submitted.
- The land had been bought as a development opportunity.
- He was challenging fly tipping in the area.
- The building would be up to 6 metres in height.
- Cars would not be parked outside the building.

In response to Members' queries, the applicant confirmed that the high level windows were to make the most of the light and could be lowered and the building would provide two storage areas.

The Strategic Director, Place then replied to Members' queries explaining that there was a high level of coal mining in the area and a report would be required to safeguard the applicant. He accepted that there was a similar building in the area, however, the proposal was a poor design and would stand out in the street scene. It would be located on a sharp bend and the applicant had indicated that it would provide two storage facilities, but it was unclear for what purpose. Members were informed that the garages previously located on the site would probably not be permitted now and the building was not ancillary to the host property. There was no off-street parking provision and the Council's Highways Department could not support the application. A sink and toilet facilities had also been proposed and the overall use of the building had not been clarified. The Strategic Director, Place stated that planning officers would be willing to discuss the scheme with the applicant.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(i) 234 Parkside Road, Bradford

Little Horton

An application to vary condition 6 of planning permission 10/05892/FUL and change the hours of use of the madrassa at 234 Parkside Road, West Bowling, Bradford from 10:00 to 19:00 to 11:30 to 23:00 each day - 17/04980/VOC

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed the variation of the operating hours, which were currently 1000 to 1900 hours, to 1130 to 2300 hours every day. The building was granted planning permission as a madrassa in 2010 with conditions and was located on a row of terraced properties in a residential area on the junction of Parkside Road and Parkway. Members noted that a previous application that requested the extension of the operating hours had been refused by the Panel and that closing at 2300 hours would affect neighbouring residential properties. The Council's Environmental Health Unit had submitted an objection to the proposal and the application was recommended for

refusal, as per the reasons set out in the report.

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

- It was an education establishment, not a madrassa.
- A request to amend the operating hours to 1000 to 1900 hours had been approved in 2010.
- It was mainly used for children's education at night and on a weekend.
- Requests had been received that the establishment was open from 1130 to 2300 hours.
- The organisation was trying to get people to learn new skills.
- He believed that officers had been mindful of previous applications which had been subject to objections.
- No objections had been received.
- The building provided services for local people.
- The organisation took care of people but the opening hours were hampering their efforts.

In response to a number of the comments, the Strategic Director, Place stated that the application form had stated that the property was a madrassa and it was not disputed that it was an education centre, however, operating until 2300 hours was a step too far in a residential area.

The Strategic Director, Place then confirmed to Members that no local residents had objected, however, this did not mean that the extension of the operating hours was not an issue. He reported that both the Council's Environmental Health Unit and Planning Department believed that the proposed operating hours were not acceptable.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

That the extended hours of use of the premises would not be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring residents by means of noise, vehicular activity and general disturbance. The proposal, therefore, satisfies policies DS5 and EN8 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

And that the application be subject to the following condition:

- (i) **That the hours of use be limited to 11.30 to 23.00 each day.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place

28. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

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

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(a) 115b Fagley Road, Bradford **Eccleshill**

Unauthorised externally mounted roller shutter - 17/00186/ENFCOU

On 25 October 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(b) 203 Allerton Road, Bradford **Thornton & Allerton**

Breach of condition 3 of planning permission 15/02547/FUL - 16/00957/ENFCOU

On 24 October 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(c) 21C Pelham Road, Bradford **Bolton & Undercliffe**

Unauthorised externally mounted roller shutter - 17/00479/ENFUNA

On 18 October 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(d) 228 Highfield Road, Bradford **Idle & Thackley**

Unauthorised heat pump unit - 17/00451/ENFUNA

On 18 October 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(e) 60 Peel Square, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised sign on Listed Building - 17/00444/ENFLBC

On 12 November 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEALS DISMISSED

(f) 270 Leeds Road, Bradford **Bowling & Barkerend**

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 16/00441/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 17/00057/APPENF

(g) 405 Thornton Road, Bradford **Thornton & Allerton**

Change of use from A1 Retail to A5 hot food takeaway - Case No: 16/09509/FUL

Appeal Ref: 17/00098/APPFL2

(h) 66 Curzon Road, Bradford **Bradford Moor**

Retrospective application for front porch - Case No: 17/03343/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00109/APPHOU

(i) 74 Poplar Grove, Bradford **Royds**

Construction of (integrated) double storey side, single rear, hipped to gable, dormers & associated design elements - Case No: 17/04489/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00108/APPHOU

(j) 77 Beacon Road, Bradford **Wibsey**

Off-street parking for single car for use by disabled person - Case No: 17/01532/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00099/APPHOU

(k) 82 Curzon Road, Bradford **Bradford Moor**

Retrospective application for front porch - Case No: 17/03970/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00110/APPHOU

(l) Canal Road, Bradford **Bolton & Undercliffe**

Replacement of an existing 48 sheet advertisement with 2no back to back 48 sheet digital LED advertisements - Case No: 17/01470/ADV

Appeal Ref: 17/00101/APPAD2

(m) Land at Frensham Drive, Bradford **Queensbury**

Residential development comprising 24 new houses and access road - Case No: 16/08789/MAO

Appeal Ref: 17/00097/APPFL2

**(n) Sanderson Building, 1-5 Feversham Street, Bowling & Barkerend
Bradford**

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 16/00433/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 17/00054/APPENF

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