

**Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel
(Bradford) held on Wednesday, 21 February 2018 in
Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford**

Commenced 10.05 am
Concluded 1.20 pm

Present – Councillors

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

Observers: Councillor Riaz Ahmed (Minute 38(b)) and
Councillor Dominic Fear (Minute 38(a))

Apologies: Councillor Alan Wainwright

Councillor S Hussain in the Chair

35. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Azam disclosed that he had met the applicant associated with one of the applications but he had not discussed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties.

Councillor Shabir Hussain disclosed that he knew a number of people associated with a number of the applications but he had not discussed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties.

ACTION: City Solicitor

36. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

37. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

38. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

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

(a) 11 and 13 Apperley Road, Bradford Idle & Thackley

A full planning application for the construction of two detached dwellings on land to the rear of 11 and 13 Apperley Road, Bradford - 17/04916/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that the site was located within a residential area and the application proposed the construction of two detached dwellings. The scheme had been amended in order to overcome the impact on neighbouring houses. The ground level of the site would be lowered by 500 metres, the distances between properties was appropriate and two parking spaces would be provided per unit. The Strategic Director, Place then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

- The report stated that it was a sustainable site.
- The scheme failed to meet the social need as there was a great deal of single occupancy in the area.
- The natural environment would be destroyed and a historic wall threatened.
- The development would impact on the homes next to the site.
- The existing wall was 10 feet in height.
- The proposed houses would overshadow number 8 and 10 Coleridge Gardens.
- Neighbouring properties would be over dominated.
- The proposed houses would be able to see into neighbours' habitable rooms.
- There would be an impact on the houses on Apperley Road.
- The impact on the old retaining wall raised concerns.
- A site visit should be undertaken and further consideration given to the proposal.
- The proposed access used to be the driveway for 13 Apperley Road.
- The drainage system was not sustainable or suitable.

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

- The Council had a duty to provide a mix of housing and there was a shortfall in the District.

- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) did not prioritise sites.
- Housing was acceptable on the site and conformed to policies.
- Trees had been cut down prior to the submission of the application, so the matter could not be assessed and their removal could not have been prevented.
- A footnote had been placed on the application in relation to the duty of care for wildlife.
- The amended plans resolved the impact on neighbours.
- A condition requiring a survey on the wall had been placed on the application.
- The criteria and distances between windows had been met.
- Overlooking could not be justified as a reason for refusal.

The Strategic Director, Place then replied to Members' queries:

- The ground floor windows would be obscured by the stone wall, the 25 degree line had been complied with and the roof lights would be subject to conditions.
- It was assumed that the site previously belonged to 11 and 13 Apperley Road.
- The distance to the boundary was 17 metres and 7 metres to windows. Overdominance was measured by the 25 degree line criteria.

An objector was present at the meeting and commented that:

- Over 20 houses and gardens would be affected.
- The wall had been built in the late 1800s to a maximum height of 3 metres but was only 1 metre high on the site.
- The wall would not withstand the construction.
- The scheme had been amended and was less onerous now.
- The conservatory had not been taken into account.
- It was appreciated that the height had been lowered but it would still be higher than other properties.
- The additional height would overwhelm neighbouring properties.
- Many residents' rear gardens would be affected.
- The site was too close to existing houses and gardens.
- The renovations to number 11 and 13 Apperley Road were welcomed.
- The new houses would stand out in the area.
- The need for houses was acknowledged, but many new houses were being built in the vicinity.
- The application should be refused.

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

- A pre-application had been submitted and the advice received had been positive.
- Work had been undertaken with the Council's Planning Department in order to mitigate concerns.
- Ground levels would be significantly lowered.
- The boundary wall would not be affected and the strain on the wall would be relieved.

- The car park was used for other purposes and fencing it off would create more issues in the area.
- The applicant should have consulted the local community.
- The proposal would affect many people.
- How would the recent application for a madrassa in the area be affected?

The Strategic Director, Place explained that the land was private and the madrassa would not have parking rights.

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

- It was a public funded car park and should be accessible.
- Traffic in the area was chaotic during school hours.
- The proposed fencing would block the emergency exit of the madrassa.
- The NHS was wanting to improve the car park.
- The use of the car park should be conditioned to the Health Centre's use during operation hours and others at any other time.
- The application should be deferred in order for discussions to be undertaken.

During the discussion Members raised issues in relation to restrictions on the use of the car park and the need for further discussions. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that it was the responsibility of the NHS to reinforce any such conditions.

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) Calder Bank Farm, Calder Banks, Queensbury, Queensbury
Bradford**

A full planning application for construction of a gravel trackway from current farm access point at Scarlet Heights across the field to existing stables associated with Calder Bank Farm, Calder Banks, Queensbury - 17/05148/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 gravel track way with access across the site, which was located within the Green Belt. Members were informed that the principle of development in the Green Belt was restrictive, however, the National Planning Policy Framework provided an exception for engineering operations such as the proposed track. The Strategic Director, Place indicated that initially there would be some disruption but the grass would grow through and recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

- There were two points of access.
- A horsebox could not fit through one of the access points and it emerged out on to a busy road.
- The proposed access was in existence and currently used by tractors.
- The proposal would not impact on the Green Belt.
- A gravel track had been proposed across the field.
- Vehicles had become stuck on the field in the past and the gravel would alleviate the risk to people and animals.
- Many of the objectors did not reside in Scarlet Heights and were unaware that the track had been there for 50 years.
- Local residents were aware of the issues and supported the scheme.
- The access already existed and the gravel would make the track safer.
- Its use would be minimal.
- It was located in an unobtrusive area and would not have a detrimental effect.
- The application should be granted.

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) and (e) 16 Chapel Street, Bradford

City

- (d) A full planning application change of use of the upper floors of 16 Chapel Street, Little Germany to provide habitable accommodation for charity use, internal alterations, replacement of rear windows and the construction of a rear dormer window. This application is considered alongside the listed building consent referenced 17/06172/LBC - 17/06171/FUL
- (e) This application seeks listed building consent for internal alterations, replacement windows and the construction of a rear dormer window to facilitate the change of use of 16 Chapel Street, Little Germany. This application is considered alongside planning application referenced 17/06171/FUL - 17/06172/LBC

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was for a change of use of the upper floors of a property used by a charity, which was a listed building and located in the Little Germany Conservation Area. The scheme proposed the construction of a significant dormer window, however, the Council’s conservation officer had taken a balanced view and requested that a condition be placed on the application. Members were informed that the Council’s Planning Department had asked for the dormer windows to be separated by a distance of 1.5 metres and located higher up the roof. Unfortunately an acceptable compromise had not been reached with the applicants and the applications had been submitted without amendment. The Strategic Director, Place stated that the building was listed and considerable consideration should be given to this point.

He indicated that the recommendation was to refuse both submissions, however, if members were minded, a deferral could be sought in order to negotiate a scheme.

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

- He was a Trustee of the Charity which had been established in 1890.
- The Charity helped under privileged children that lived in shameful conditions.
- The scheme would provide overnight accommodation and benefit children in Bradford.
- The application was recommended for refusal based upon aesthetics.
- The Council's conservation officer had supported the proposal and recommended approval.
- The Council's Planning Department had stated the dormer would be a large and obtrusive structure.
- There was a large dormer on top of the Playhouse and other buildings in the vicinity.
- The report stated that there were long views of the row of buildings on the approach to the City via Leeds Road. This was incorrect as the property could not be seen.
- The dormer would be obscured.
- The car park in front of the building was for sale and could be built on.
- It was accepted that the dormer window would be visible from some aspects.
- The Planning Department had requested two dormer windows but this would not be viable.
- Bradford Civic Society and others had supported the application.

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

- The height in the roof space was hampered by the existing trusses.
- A larger flat dormer would maximise the roof space.
- The construction of two 1.5 metre dormers would make it difficult to retain the existing staircase and the head height would be restricted.
- The dormer would be located on the rear elevation.
- The building would be improved.

The Strategic Director, Place in response stated that the purpose of a listed building was to recognise the importance and preserve the features, however, he indicated that he believed there was an acceptable compromise that could be reached.

During the discussion a Member acknowledged the work undertaken by the charity and the position of the building on a major route into the City Centre. He suggested that the application be deferred in order for a solution to be negotiated and if a decision could not be reached then the application should be resubmitted to the Panel for consideration.

Resolved –

(d) and (e):

That the applications be deferred and delegated to officers in order for further negotiations to be undertaken with the applicant and that if a decision is not made within three months then the applications be referred back to the Panel for consideration.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(f) 24 Summerville Road, Bradford

City

A full planning application for the change of use of a warehouse to a café at 24 Summerville Road, Bradford - 17/06043/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed the Panel that the application proposed a change of use from a warehouse to a café at a site that was located within a similar row of buildings. The scheme suggested that the forecourt was turned into nine parking spaces, as there was none at present. However, the Council's Highways Department had objected to the proposal as an insufficient number of spaces had been provided and the forecourt was part of the public highway. The building was sited within an employment zone and its use would not be supported or appropriate. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that there were residential properties nearby and concerns had been raised regarding the increased activity at the premises. He reported that the applicant had provided information in relation to the expected use and Members were informed that the use would lead to an increase of noise and disturbance late at night. The application was then recommended for refusal, as per the reasons set out in the report.

The applicant was present at the meeting and stated that:

- The concerns raised were acknowledged.
- He had met the planning officer prior to submitting the application and believed that the advice he had received had been misleading.
- The business would be aimed at students, as many lived in the area.
- Reasons given to support his application by the planning officer had now been turned into points for refusal.
- He had invested money into the property.
- The Planning Department had informed him that they would support the scheme if on a small scale.
- An offer to withdraw the proposed parking had been submitted and clients would be advised to use a nearby car park.
- The Highways Department had stated that they would not support the application as it was similar to a submission for number 14, therefore, his application was not being judged on its own merits.
- 10 to 12 staff would be employed.
- Seating for 30 to 50 would be provided.

- The proposal would be beneficial to a dilapidated area.
- The application should be approved.

A Member of the Panel clarified that he had been introduced to the applicant at an event the previous evening, but had not discussed the application. He continued stating that investment was welcomed in the area, which he knew well, however, there were residential properties in the vicinity and the area was not viable or acceptable for the proposed use.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding the car park mentioned by the applicant, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that various discussions had taken place with the agent, along with emails with the applicant and the Council's Highways Department. The Planning Department were unaware of the pay and display car park in the vicinity, however, the Council's Highways Department had stated that it could not be used to justify the use of the building as a café and their objection remained due to the lack of parking provision. Members noted that small cafes could support an employment zone but the proposed business would be large scale and this would be prejudicial as it could support a large employment use.

During the discussion the Chair raised concerns in respect of the Great Horton Road area and explained that there were many businesses in the vicinity that struggled with parking. He indicated that would like to support a new business, however, he was unable to on this occasion and in light of the area.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(g) 40 Sunderland Road, Bradford

Manningham

A householder planning application seeking planning permission for a front dormer window at 40 Sunderland Road, Bradford - 17/06712/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application proposed a front dormer to a property that was located within the Manningham Conservation Area. There were other dormers in the vicinity that had been constructed pre and post planning policies. It was noted that a previous application for a dormer window had been refused in 2017 due to its undesirable size and design. A similar proposal for a dormer window had also been refused at number 27, which had been supported by the Planning Inspector. The Strategic Director, Place informed the Panel that an email from a Ward Councillor had been received in support of the application on the grounds of medical conditions and exceptional circumstances. He indicated that there were other rooms in the property that could cater for the occupier with medical conditions. The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reason set out in the report.

The Chair acknowledged that the property was located in a conservation area, but noted that all the houses were different, very small and unable to be extended. In response the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that front dormer windows were permitted, however, they needed to be an appropriate design and within the parameters of the Council's policies. The Chair then referred to the medical evidence provided and indicated that this could be taken into consideration.

A supporter of the applicant was present at the meeting and raised the following concerns:

- Medical evidence had been circulated which explained the situation.
- Exceptional circumstances were involved and the Panel could depart from Council policies.
- The medical issues were exceptional.
- The family had been advised by their doctor and the school that the children needed to have their own bedrooms.
- Light was required in the bedroom to permit study.
- The application should be approved on the grounds of the children's health and education.

In light of Members' queries, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that:

- A 1.5 metre dormer to the front would provide sufficient light and space and there were other available bedrooms. The Council's policy needed to be adhered to.
- The Council's policy was clear that 1.5 metre was the maximum size, which would provide a reasonable size bedroom and a roof light.
- An appeal had been refused for a larger dormer on the opposite side of the road.
- Council policies had to be followed and there was an appeal decisions in the Council's favour.
- There was an existing dormer to the rear of the property.

During the discussion the Chair acknowledged the medical evidence submitted and the size of the property. The City Solicitor explained that the Panel would need to balance the decision between the medical evidence and the established policy, noting that the dormer window would be permanent and would not be seen to enhance or improve the conservation area.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

That the special medical circumstances of the family provide sufficient reasons for the application to be an exception to the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document and Policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan.

And that the application be subject to the following condition:

- (1) **The development hereby permitted shall be constructed using external facing and roofing materials to match the existing building**

as is specified on the submitted application.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials in the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(h) 49 Hastings Street, Bradford

Queensbury

Full planning permission is sought for the alteration and extension of the Mosque at 49 Hastings Street, Bradford - 17/06527/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application sought alterations and an extension to the Mosque that was located on a limited site with insufficient parking provision. There were no objections to the appearance or impact on neighbouring properties, but concerns had been raised in relation to highway safety. In 2010 an application to increase the floor space by 70% had been refused, a recent proposal to expand the building by 96% had been withdrawn and the current application requested an enlargement of 76%. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that a great deal of on-street parking took place in the vicinity and any addition to the scale would intensify the demand for parking and cause harm to highway safety. He then recommended the application for refusal, as per the reason set out in the report.

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

- The substantial increase in floor space of 76% would permit a significant occupancy expansion.
- The property could be accessed through the gates but the site area was limited and there was no on-site parking.
- It could not be stated for definite that the proposal would lead to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety, as vehicles could be parked safely, however, the proposal would more than likely lead to highway safety issues.
- Arguments had been given that people would walk to the venue, but this was not the case. People would drive to their own Mosque and evidence was available that detailed there would be an impact for the short period of time. The site was located near to a junction and a school and the proposed major increase in size would create problems.

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

- He had looked at the proposed extension from 1 Broadway Close.
- There was no mention in the report about the relationship between the application site and his client's property.
- In 1993 the building was converted into a madrassa but there were no documents.
- In 2010 the planning application described the building as a Mosque and

had been refused.

- It was a highly residential area and many cars parked on the street.
- There was no off-street parking in the area.
- The use of the mosque had intensified over the years.
- People did not walk to the building.
- Access to his client's property had been blocked.
- No parking spaces had been offered, so the proposal did not comply with the Council's standards.
- The development would impact on his client's and other residential properties.
- Local residents were reliant on on-street parking.
- The application should be refused.

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

- An application for a change of use had been approved in 1993, an extension for storage granted in 1997, a proposal for an extension refused in 2010 and a further application had been withdrawn in 2017.
- Meetings had taken place with planning officers and a Ward Councillor.
- It was imperative that the scheme was submitted for approval.
- The building had limited floor space and could not accommodate the growing population.
- The increase in floor space was only 40% and not 76% as stated in the report.
- The report stated the floor space was 344 square metres when it was actually 433 square metres.
- The needs of growing families in the area needed to be met.
- The highway safety concerns were acknowledged, however, had the site been visited and a traffic survey undertaken, as it was believed that this had not occurred.
- Broadway Avenue did not have any residential properties.

A supporter of the applicant was present at the meeting and stated that:

- The scheme would not be detrimental to neighbouring properties.
- The main concern was highway safety.
- There were no houses on Broadway Avenue.
- Every Mosque in Bradford had issues for a period of time on a Friday.
- It was a local Mosque and used by local residents.

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

- The separation distance to 1 Broadway Close was 16 metres, which was sufficient not to cause significant harm.
- The highway safety issue remained.
- There would be a substantial increase in the floor space and it had been calculated as 76%.
- If the building was extended it could cater for larger events.

Members posed queries and were informed by the Strategic Director, Place that:

- The increase in floor space would be 76% which was significant and provided two large assembly halls. Concerns had been raised in relation to other possible events that could take place and the detrimental harm caused when the building was at full capacity.
- 24 car parking spaces would be required and there was insufficient room within the curtilage. Site visits were undertaken and guidelines were provided within policies. The building currently required 14 spaces and the proposed increase would need an additional 10. If the extra floor space had been 40%, then six spaces would have been required, however, none had been provided. It may be possible to provide one or two spaces within the buildings boundary, though this would not address the concerns raised. Special events that took place occasionally were discounted but the requirement had been assessed on a weekly use and it had been concluded that it was unacceptable.
- An on-site traffic survey would not have been carried out for this type of application. It was dependent on the size of the scheme and the responsibility of the developer to submit a survey for interrogation.
- It was a residential area and there were no car parks in the vicinity.

The Chair stated that Friday afternoons would be busy, however, there were many Mosques in Bradford and he believed that the facility would be used by local people who walked there, though there may be some cars from people who were passing by. He confirmed that he attended a local Mosque which had expanded due to the growing residential population.

During the discussion Members indicated that they were minded to approve the application, as they did not believe that the proposal would result in an increase in vehicle movement. The Strategic Director, Place explained that a Traffic Regulation Order would be required to provide permit parking if issues occurred and Members agreed that the best way forward would be for the applicant to complete a Section 106 Agreement.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

That the proposal would be unlikely to produce a significant increase in traffic movement and on street parking in the vicinity and would comply with policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

And in the event of additional car parking requirements, that a Section 106 Agreement for the provision of a Traffic Regulation Order be undertaken and if not completed within three months that the application be delegated to officers to refuse for the reasons given in the report.

And that the application be subject to the following condition:

- (i) **Before development above damp proof course commences on site, arrangements shall be made with the Local Planning Authority for the inspection of all external facing and roofing materials to be used in**

the development hereby permitted. The samples shall then be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials in the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Action: Strategic Director, Place

39. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

The Strategic Director, Place presented **Document “N”** and the Panel noted the following:

DISCONTINUANCE NOTICE

(a) 822 Leeds Road, Bradford Bradford Moor

Enforcement Case Ref: 17/00447/ENFADV

Date Discontinuance Action Authorised: 2 January 2018

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(b) 108 Toller Lane, Bradford Eccleshill

Unauthorised rear extension, storage container and clothing bank-
17/00280/ENFCON

On 8 January 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice (Breach of Condition).

(c) 108 Farm Hill Road, Bradford Toller

Breach of condition 2 planning permission 08/01940/FUL - 16/00027/ENFUNA

On 22 January 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(d) 1186 Bolton Road, Bradford Bolton & Undercliffe

Unauthorised gates and fencing- 17/00825/ENFUNA

On 19 January 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(e) 145 Toller Lane, Bradford Toller

Unauthorised extractor flue - 17/00433/ENFUNA

On 9 January 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(f) 151 Toller Lane, Bradford **Toller**

Unauthorised extractor flue - 17/00421/ENFUNA

On 9 January 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(g) 195 New Line, Bradford **Idle & Thackley**

Unauthorised condenser units - 16/00905/ENFAPP

On 22 January 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(h) 198 Upper Woodlands Road, Bradford **Toller**

Unauthorised dormer windows - 14/00569/ENFUNA

On 9 January 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(i) 76 Manningham Lane, Bradford **Manningham**

Unauthorised externally mounted roller shutter - 17/00265/ENFUNA

On 22 November 2017 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEAL ALLOWED

(j) 97 Duchy Drive, Bradford **Toller**

Construction of front dormer window - Case No: 17/01990/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00119/APPHOU

APPEALS DISMISSED

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

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 15/00645/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 17/00089/APPENF

(l) 139 St Helena Road, Bradford **Royds**

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 17/00027/ENFCOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00076/APPENF

(m) Omar Food Store, 54 St Margaret's Road, Bradford City

Change of use of A1 retail shop to a mixed use as an A1 retail shop with the introduction of sales of takeaway roti and naan products baked on site - Case No: 17/00795/FUL

Appeal Ref: 17/00121/APPFL2

(n) Unit 1, 900 Leeds Road, Bradford Bradford Moor

Alterations for new vehicular access/egress from Leeds Road dedicated onto Diner 900 car park with 2400x43000 visibility splays - Case No: 17/02478/FUL

Appeal Ref: 17/00106/APPFL2

(o) 9 Creskeld Way, Bradford Thornton & Allerton

Construction of ground floor extension and dormer window to front elevation - Case No: 17/03002/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00118/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