

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday, 4 July 2018 in Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.05 am
Concluded 1.20 pm

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
Barker Whitaker	S Hussain Wainwright Amran Watson	R Ahmed

Observers: Councillor Kamran Hussain (Minute 5(e)) and
Councillor Rizwana Jamil (Minute 5(g))

Councillor S Hussain in the Chair

1. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

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

Councillor Riaz Ahmed disclosed that he knew the landlord in relation to Upper Ground Floor, Clifton Mill, Clifton Street, Manningham, Bradford (Minute 6(l)) and he therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item in accordance with the requirements of the Members' Code of Conduct (Part 4A of the Constitution) and the Members' Planning Code of Conduct (Part 4B of the Constitution).

ACTION: *City Solicitor*

2. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2018 be signed as a correct record.

3. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

5. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

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

(a) 1 West Lane, Thornton, Bradford

Thornton & Allerton

Change of use from hairdressers with flat above to micro pub, new shop front and side window to shop area at 1 West Lane, Thornton, Bradford - 18/01000/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application was for a change of use from a hairdresser and flat to a micro pub, with new windows to be installed to the front and side of the property. The bar area would be to the rear of the ground floor and a seating area above. Members noted that representations in objection and support had been received and the issues raised were detailed in the officer's report. The Strategic Director, Place stated that a condition in respect of the hours of use had been placed on the application and the proposal was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions.

The Strategic Director, Place explained to Members that:

- The same operating hours as the nearby pub had not been proposed as there were residential properties nearby.
- The flat would be utilised.
- On-street parking would be available.
- A micro pub was an independent business housed in a small building.
- The premises was sited in the local centre and on-street parking was available. The existing business would create parking and it would not be an issue.
- The existing pub did not have any planning restrictions, however, there would be licensing restrictions.
- The Planning Department had to consider residential amenity and the applicant had accepted the proposed hours.
- Delivery vehicles would not be large.
- Details of the white lining requested by the Council's Highways Department were required and needed to be agreed.
- The white lining would stop vehicles parking at the pedestrian crossing and

- should go across the frontage of the property.
- The applicant would have to pay for the white lining.

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

- On-street parking was plentiful.
- The property would be appealing to the local community, not drivers.
- There had been a nursery in the vicinity previously and parking had not been an issue.
- Lots of shops had closed, so more parking was available.
- It would still be a commercial property.
- People should be permitted to drink where they wanted to.
- There were no safety issues.
- The parking objections were irrelevant.
- More businesses needed to open in the area.
- There was a large area to the front of the building that could be utilised.
- The same operating hours as the pub would be welcomed.
- There were residential properties at the rear of the pub.
- At least one full time and a part time job would be created.

During the discussion Members suggested that the same operating hours as the public house 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 and also subject to the following amendment to condition 2:

2. **The use of the premises shall be restricted to the hours from 1100 to midnight Sunday to Thursday and from 1100 to 0200 hours Friday, Saturday and Bank or Public Holidays.**

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring residents and to accord with policies DS5 and EN8 of the adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(b) 1A Brae Avenue, Bradford

Bolton & Undercliffe

Retrospective change of use of basement from residential (C3) to education (D1) at 1A Brae Avenue, Bradford - 18/00521/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 a change of use of the basement from residential to education. The applicant was a teacher who used the basement area of his home on a weekend for education purposes. There were issues in the vicinity in relation to inconsiderate parking, however, there was sufficient on street provision and

officers were satisfied that the submission would not be harmful to on-street safety. The application was then recommended for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to a Member's questions, the Strategic Director, Place explained that the vehicles attending the property would be dropping off and collecting children. He confirmed that D1 use required four parking spaces and they could be accommodated in the vicinity.

A couple of Members then expressed concerns in relation to parking issues, restricting the number of people permitted in the property and fire regulations. The Strategic Director, Place stated that the means of exit was through patio doors and it would not be enforceable to limit the number of attendees, as this was already restricted due to the available space. He clarified that if the facility became popular, planning permission would be required to expand and a condition could be placed on the application to ensure that it remained as an education centre only.

It was then proposed that the application be approved on a temporary basis and that additional conditions be added in order to restrict the use and the hours of operation.

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 also subject to the following additional conditions:

- (i) The use hereby permitted shall cease to operate on or before 05 July 2021 unless the Local Planning Authority has previously permitted its retention for a further period.**

Reason: The Local Planning Authority is prepared only to grant planning permission on a temporary basis in view of the nature of the use, in the interest of neighbour's amenities and to accord with Policy DS5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

- (ii) The use of the premises hereby permitted shall be as a D1 education facility as described in the application documents only. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Order, or any subsequent equivalent legislation, the premises shall not be used for any other non-domestic business purpose (including any other activity within Class D1 of the Order).**

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority retains control over future changes of use with particular regard to the amenity of neighbouring residents and parking provision at the site, and to accord with Policies DS5 and TR2 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

- (ii) The use of the premises for the provision of education (use class D1) shall be restricted to the hours between 09-00 and 15-00 on Saturdays and between 09-00 and 15-00 on Sundays and the premises shall not**

operate for the provision of education at any other time.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring residents and to accord with policies DS1, DS3 and EN8 of the adopted Core Strategy for the Local Plan for the Bradford District.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(c) 4 Spencer Road, Bradford City

Change of use from class A1 (Retail) to class A3 (Cafe) with owners' accommodation above, installation of flue at 4 Spencer Road, Bradford - 18/01645/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place explained that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.

Resolved –

That the withdrawal of the application by the applicant prior to the meeting be noted.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

**(d) Land at Grid Ref 409168 430017 Bradshaw View, Queensbury
Queensbury, Bradford**

A full planning application seeking permission for the construction five detached dwellings at Bradshaw View, Queensbury, Bradford - 18/00920/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He stated that the application sought the construction of five detached dwellings with access from Old Guy Road and the extension of the existing footpath. Three of the proposed dwellings would be four bedroomed and be sited along one boundary. The other two houses would be three bedroomed properties and be located along the other boundary. Members were informed that Council policy distances had been retained and confirmed that officers were satisfied. Representations in objection to the scheme had been submitted and were detailed within the report. An additional objection had been received since the publication of the report in respect of the revised drawings, which raised concerns in relation to overlooking and distances. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that the Council's policies required 17 metres distance between windows and 7 metres to boundaries. The closest property would be 18.5 metres window to window, therefore there would not be any significant overlooking. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

- The drawings raised concerns.

- The distance between properties was not adequate.
- Ground levels rose and he believed that the total elevation would be three metres.
- The ground floor windows appeared to be on a level with his bedroom and the upper windows would overlook his house and garden.
- A higher boundary fence had not been mentioned.
- He would not have any privacy in his house or garden.
- The development would be overbearing and visually intrusive.
- He did not agree that a 20 metre distance was acceptable due to the level changes if the site.
- Surface water drainage was an issue.
- The existing houses should not be overlooked by new houses.
- Bats had been seen in the area.
- He had lived in his property for 18 years.
- The plot had previously been the farm's garden and was a habitat for wildlife.
- He had undertaken a great deal of research and the Council's distance requirement of 17 metres was low, as other Local Authorities required 22 metres.
- The increase in elevation should increase the distance between properties.
- Too many houses were proposed for the site.
- Bungalows would be more suitable.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Place sympathised with the objector's situation, however, he explained that the Council had adopted the separation distances and the scheme would not cause significant overlooking. Members were informed that properties on Bradshaw View were sited at similar distances to the proposed development. In relation to the levels of the site, it was noted that the distance to the rear wall of the objector's house would be 19.7 metres and there would be 9 metres to the boundary. In conclusion, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that the proposal complied with Council's policy.

Members then posed questions and were informed that:

- A landscaping scheme could be requested as a condition, however, it could cause issues in relation to loss of light and, therefore, it was not recommended.
- The distance required between windows was 17 metres and 19.7 metres would be provided.
- The rise in land levels had been taken into consideration and 19.7 metres had been allowed.
- Members could only consider the application submitted.

The applicant was present at the meeting and indicated that it was family land which needed to be developed and he had tried to compile a scheme that met the Council's requirements.

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

(e) 135-137 Toller Lane, Bradford

Toller

A retrospective application for a single storey waste recycling enclosure and revised extract flues at 135-137 Toller Lane, Bradford - 17/06894/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 part retrospective for a waste recycling area at a premises that was located within a row of commercial units, with residential properties in the vicinity. The scheme proposed that the render, flues and roof of the enclosure be painted in order to mitigate the impact on visual amenity. It was noted that no objections had been received and a letter of support from a Ward Councillor had been received that stated the development had reduced noise pollution. The Strategic Director, Place reported that the previous application had been refused on three grounds and two had now been resolved, however, the impact on the surrounding area was still an issue. He stated that a stone finish was required in order to fit in with the character of the traditional properties and then recommended the application for refusal as per the reason set out in the report.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Strategic Director, Place clarified that:

- It was not a conservation area, however, a stone finish would be in better keeping with the area.
- The flues were not an issue, however, the applicant had stated that he would paint them. The number of flues had been reduced from four to two and a condition could be placed on the application regarding their painting.
- The flues were an improvement but stone should be used for the recycling enclosure.
- The structure was visible from residential properties and the main road.
- The proposal would be more likely to be accepted if it were stone clad.

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

- He had visited the site and was unsure what officers wanted.
- The outbuilding housed waste bins.
- There had been a reduction in fly tipping in the area.
- The bins were kept in the building.
- The applicant had wanted to reduce fly tipping and anti social behaviour in the area.
- The applicant was being penalised for improving the area.
- Residents had stated that issues in the area had reduced.
- There was another outbuilding on Duckworth Lane that had been

- constructed from metal and no objections had been received.
- The proposal did not raise any concerns.

The Strategic Director, Place explained that the applicant had been informed that stone cladding would be acceptable on submission of the proposal, however, he had not agreed to the suggestion. He stated that if Members were minded to approve the application with a condition regarding the appearance, then it would need to be deferred and delegated to officers to negotiate a way forward.

Resolved –

That the application be deferred and delegated to officers in order for further negotiations to be undertaken with the applicant in relation to the appearance of the outbuilding and the painting of the external flue; and that if a decision is not made within three months then the application be delegated to officers to refuse permission for the reasons given in the Officer's report in liaison with the Chair of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford).

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(f) 18 Heaton Grove, Bradford

Heaton

A householder application for the construction of a detached annex building to provide ground floor accommodation for disabled family members at 18 Heaton Grove, Bradford - 17/05494/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place explained that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.

Resolved –

That the withdrawal of the application by the applicant prior to the meeting be noted.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(g) 19 Brompton Avenue, Bradford

Bowling & Barkerend

Retrospective application for front dormer window, hip to gable conversion, single storey rear extension, covered terrace and lowered ground level to rear garden and demolition of outbuildings at 19 Brompton Avenue, Bradford - 18/01667/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application was retrospective and the majority of the work had been completed. The constructed extension was 6 metres in depth when the Council's policy only permitted 3 metres and the change in the levels of the buildings at the rear meant that it towered over neighbouring properties. The drawings had been revised to overcome some of the issues and the rear dormer would now be clad in tiles.

The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reasons set out in the officer's report.

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

- He had not been involved in the previous applications.
- Planning officers had been contacted and he acknowledged that the extension was the issue.
- Neither neighbour had submitted an objection.
- It was acknowledged that the extension exceeded the 3 metre policy.
- Neighbours had been made fully aware of the proposal.
- He had been involved in two appeal applications regarding substantial extensions and they had been granted by the Planning Inspector.
- The Planning Inspector had stated that policies should not be slavishly applied but considered on their own merit.
- There were substantial extensions in the area.
- The proposed extension was appropriate and reasonable.
- The application could be approved without compromise.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Place reiterated that the extension exceeded the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (HSPD) by 3 metres and no justification had been provided. He acknowledged that the immediate neighbours had not objected to the development, however, this was not material in planning as future occupants had to be taken into consideration. The neighbours to the rear had made representations. It was also noted that the comparing of permitted extensions was not possible.

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

- The property would have four bedrooms and the additional rooms could have been accommodated in a 3 metre extension.
- The driveway and highway safety would not be affected by the development.
- The revised drawings overcame issues, however, the extension was a significant problem.
- 6 metre extensions were not permitted under Council policy.

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

- The property was a well established semi-detached dwelling.
- Neither of the adjoining neighbours had objected to the development.
- There were no residential amenity issues.
- The applicant had attended planning advice sessions.
- There had been no intention to undertake the work without permission.
- The pre-planning advice given had been that the work would be covered under permitted development.
- The neighbours at the rear had objected, but this was due to longstanding disputes.
- The applicant wanted to work with the Planning Department and revise the scheme.

In response to further questions from Members, the Strategic Director, Place explained that:

- He was not aware of any similar extensions in the vicinity.
- No other properties on the road had front dormers.
- The front dormer complied with the Council's HSPD. Members needed to consider the impact on other properties and note that neighbours had not submitted letters in support of the scheme. Residents of Flockton Road had objected to the development and the rear 6 metre extension could not be approved.
- No evidence had been submitted to substantiate a neighbour dispute.
- A general planning service was provided that gave wide ranging advice. He was not aware of any advice that had been provided prior to the submission of the applications and the matter had been brought to light at the enforcement stage.
- The rear extension would cause over shadowing and be over bearing.
- The hedge could be a party wall. The 6 metre rear extension was the issue, not the maintenance of the hedge.
- Special circumstances had not been submitted and the work had been carried out without planning permission. Exceptions could not be made.

During the discussion Members acknowledged that people could not afford to move properties, so large extensions were being built. The Strategic Director, Place reiterated that the 6 metre extension was the issue and a 3 metre one would be adequate. He confirmed that the Council's policy considered the impact on neighbours. There was a tall wall on a raised terrace, which had been created due to the change in levels and this too was contrary to policies. A Member stated that no special circumstances to justify the development had been submitted. It was noted that that the extension was the issue, however, nothing had been presented in order to mitigate its effects. Another Member added that it was twice the permitted size of developments permitted under Council policy and was overpowering in appearance.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(h) & (j) 20 & 22 Pemberton Drive, Bradford

City

(h) A retrospective application to retain front and rear dormers as built at 20 Pemberton Drive, Bradford- 18/01328/FUL

(j) A retrospective application to retain front and rear dormers as built at 22 Pemberton Drive, Bradford - 18/01327/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the applications were

retrospective and that the properties had been subject to a fire, at some point, where the roof had been damaged. It was noted that the applications had been received in 2016 following the work being undertaken and acceptable schemes had then been agreed with the Planning Department, however, the current submission was a result of the work to the roof and dormer windows not being carried out in accordance with the agreed plans. The roof gables should have been reinstated and dormer windows constructed between them, but two large dormers had been built instead. The Strategic Director, Place explained that the dormers to the front of the properties were linked and different stone had been used. He confirmed that the dormers to the rear were less of an issue though were still a poor design in a Conservation Area. Members were informed that two small dormers to the front and three small to the rear had been agreed. The applications were then recommended for refusal, as per the reasons set out in both officers' reports.

The applicant's builder was present at the meeting and made the following points in support of the application:

- The properties had been subject to a fire.
- The owner of the property had spent a large amount of money on restoring the roof.
- The cost to reinstate the dormers to plans had been significant.
- Ward Councillors were in support of the application.
- The property had been empty for 18 months.
- It would be beneficial for the property to be occupied.
- Anti-social behaviour occurred in the vicinity.
- The Panel should take a sensible approach.
- The scheme would benefit the community.
- The owner wanted the property to be occupied and bring the area back into use.
- He had tried to replicate the dormers as agreed.

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

- It was appreciated that the scheme had not followed the Conservation Area policies.
- Vandalism and drug use occurred in the area.
- They had endeavoured to get the best scheme with the builders.
- It would be better for the properties to be occupied rather than empty.
- The eaves would not allow the minimum space requirements and the properties would lose two bedrooms each.

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

- There had been an arson attack and the roof of the properties had been destroyed.
- A notice to repair the roof in 21 days had been sent by the Council.
- Additional time to carry out the repairs had been requested but the Council's Planning Department had stated that scaffold had to be erected at the property within 14 days.
- A builder had been employed and architects had been consulted, but the

- submitted plans had been refused.
- The scheme tried to fit in with the area.
 - Anti social behaviour occurred in the area and many of the properties were used by drug users.
 - There had been many issues regarding the empty buildings in the area.
 - The neighbours had raised concerns.
 - If the application was refused then it would affect the whole area.
 - The properties needed to be occupied.
 - A great deal had been learnt through the process.
 - It had been paramount that the roof was replaced and the work had been undertaken as soon as possible.

The Chair then berated the builder stating that as he had been in the trade for over 20 years he would have been aware of the Council's policies and that the properties were located in a Conservation Area.

The Strategic Director, Place explained that the owner would have been sent a notice to make the properties safe and secure, following this an application should have been made to undertake the work required. He welcomed that the agent had acknowledged the harm caused to the Conservation Area and visual amenity and indicated that he believed that there would be a scheme which could meet all the Council's requirements.

A Member referred to the request by the builder to "take a sensible approach" and confirmed that the Panel always did. He added that previous plans would have been available and the builder should have been able to replicate the roof. Another Member expressed his annoyance with the builder and architect. He stated that the development looked disgraceful and the mistake needed to be rectified. It was also questioned as to why there had been a rush to complete the work before consulting with the Planning Department. A Member concurred that advice should have been sought and procedures followed. The streets needed to be maintained and the area conserved. The Chair reiterated his dismay with the builder and concluded that the development was out of character and Conservation Areas should be preserved.

Resolved –

- (h) & (j) That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place

- (i) 201A & 203A Great Horton Road and 26 & 28 Alexandra Street, Bradford City**

Retrospective application for dormers to side of each property at 201A & 203A Great Horton Road and 26 & 28 Alexandra Street, Bradford - 18/00850/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application affected four properties and was retrospective for the retention of dormer windows. The

Council policy permitted dormers up to three metres wide with cladding matching the material of the roof to the side, however, those constructed spanned the whole width of the properties and were covered to a large degree by uPVC cladding, which was contrary to the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (HSPD). Members were informed that a similar dormer had been refused in December 2017. All the dormers had been constructed at the same time and it was recommended that the application be refused due to their excessive width and obtrusive feature in the street scene.

In response to a query regarding the previous refused application, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that it only applied to one property, whereas the submitted application related to all four properties as the dormers had been built at the same time.

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

- The dormers to the front of the properties had been approved.
- The applicant had been misinformed that planning permission would not be required.
- The previous application had been refused due to the size and cladding.
- The applicant owned three of the properties.
- 17 people lived in the property.
- The three additional rooms relieved overcrowding.
- One family member had special needs.
- The owner of 203A Great Horton Road had agreed to construct the dormer windows together.
- The applicant had invested his savings into the development.
- The applicant had naively accepted the advice of the previous agent.
- The dormers had a minimal impact on the properties.
- A mistake had been made by the owner.
- The white uPVC cladding could be removed if it would resolve the issues raised.

In response to a comment made, the Strategic Director, Place stated that the Council would support the dormers if they complied with its policies, however, the proposed dormers were in excess of what was permitted.

A Member questioned whether any evidence had been submitted in relation to the family member with special needs. The Interim City Solicitor confirmed that it would have been preferable if documents had been submitted, however, they had not, therefore it was proper to enquire if special circumstances existed in order for a decision to be made. The Strategic Director, Place added that if the applicant had wanted to claim disability reasons, proof should have been submitted previously. He clarified that the application created more rooms than for one person and the work had been carried out without planning permission.

In response to further queries, Members were informed that:

- The Council's policy required the dormer to be three metres wide without cladding. The replacement of the white uPVC with grey cladding would not overcome the harm to visual amenity.

- Building regulations were not required to ensure planning permission and dormers should be similar to others in the area.
- The Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (HSPD) set out what was required.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(k) 4 Heaton Grove, Bradford

Heaton

A householder application for the construction of a garden store at 4 Heaton Grove, Bradford at 4 Heaton Grove, Bradford - 18/01359/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place explained that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.

Resolved –

That the withdrawal of the application by the applicant prior to the meeting be noted.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

**(l) Upper Ground Floor, Clifton Mill, Clifton Street, Manningham
Manningham, Bradford**

A retrospective application for the change of use of the Upper Ground Floor of Clifton Mill, Clifton Street, Bradford from a warehouse/office to a snooker lounge - 17/06659/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application was retrospective for the change of use to a snooker lounge. The building was in close proximity to residential properties and there was a residents parking permit scheme in the area. Parking was an issue as the application did not propose any allocated places and the evening use had resulted in conflict over spaces. The application was then recommended for refusal, as per the reason set out in the report.

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

- He had lived in the area for eight years.
- The other businesses in the vicinity did not cause any issues.
- Parking permits had been issued as a school had opened nearby and caused parking problems.
- Disturbances occurred at night.

- He had called the police due to an incident that had taken place.
- Other residents had complained about the premises.
- Since the business had opened theft, drug use and parking issues had occurred.
- Complaints had been submitted in relation to the issues.
- He was not against the business, but it should not affect his home life on an evening.
- Many disturbances had taken place outside the premises and his family were scared.
- There had not been any problems in the area before the business opened.
- Sometimes his driveway would be blocked.

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

- He had opened a youth centre in a building that had not been in use.
- Neighbours had complained.
- The building's windows were tinted.
- There were plenty of parking spaces outside the building.
- The traffic issues were due to the school during the day.
- He had opened the facility to get youths off the streets.
- The incident had been a fight between a couple and the female had been arrested.
- Robberies at properties were nothing to do with the centre, as it had been closed.
- He had assisted police in the capture of the perpetrator.
- Notices asking customers not to park indiscriminately were on display.
- The building had been derelict and was now a benefit for the community.
- The facility removed youths from hanging around on streets.
- The mills had access to parking on one side of the street.
- Only two incidents had occurred outside since the facility had opened.

The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that it was a public road outside the premises and anyone could park there. A Member acknowledged that the scheme required eleven parking spaces and another noted that complaints regarding parking had been submitted. The applicant stated that he had complied with the Council's requests but had not been sure if planning permission had been required. The premises had a CCTV system and he asked people to be quiet.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

6. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

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

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(a) 12 Melbourne Terrace, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised dormer on the front roof slope of a listed building -
17/00711/ENFLBC

On 4 June 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice and an Enforcement Notice.

(b) 194 Canterbury Avenue, Bradford **Little Horton**

Unauthorised structure - 17/00437/ENFCOU

On 26 April 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

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

Unauthorised front extension - 16/00725/ENFUNA

On 17 May 2018 the Planning Manager authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

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

Unauthorised front extension - 17/00374/ENFUNA

On 17 May 2018 the Planning Manager authorised enforcement action on 6 March 2018.

**(e) Land to the West of Sandbeds Farm,
Trough Lane, Denholme** **Bingley Rural**

Unauthorised development - 17/00824/ENFUNA

The Development Services Manager authorised the issue of a Temporary Stop Notice under delegated powers on 1 May 2018.

(f) Land at South View Works, Dirk Hill, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised use of land in connection with a business that stores, dismantles and repairs motor vehicles and supplies recycled motor vehicle spares -
17/00732/ENFCOU

The Area Planning Manager authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 22 May 2018.

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEAL ALLOWED

(g) Land at Kings Drive, Bolton Hall Road, Bradford Windhill & Wrose

Appeal Ref: 18/00023/APPOU2

Proposed construction of 23 residential units consisting of 17 dwellings and 6 bungalows - Case No: 17/05355/MAO

APPEALS DISMISSED

(h) 21 Dracup Road, Bradford Great Horton

Dormer windows to front and rear and retrospective two-storey side extension - Case No: 17/04810/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00014/APPHOU

(i) 3 New Augustus Street, Bradford Bowling & Barkerend

1 No 48 sheet freestanding digital advertising display unit - Case No: 17/06532/ADV

Appeal Ref: 18/00025/APPAD1

(j) 56 St Wilfrids Crescent, Bradford Great Horton

Appeal against Enforcement notice - Case No: 14/00812/ENFAPP

Appeal Ref: 18/00009/APPENF

(k) 56 West Cote Drive, Thackley, Bradford Idle & Thackley

Construction of single storey rear extension - Case No: 17/05278/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00011/APPHOU

(l) 8 Lynch Avenue, Bradford Great Horton

Construction of three storey side and rear extension with amendments - Case No: 17/05410/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00137/APPHOU

(m) Clayton Edge Farm, Station Road, Queensbury, Bradford Queensbury

Change of use of agricultural building to two holiday lets - Case No: 17/02679/FUL

Appeal Ref: 17/00125/APPFL2

(n) **Former 53 -61 Lidget Place, Bradford**

Great Horton

Construction of vehicle repair garage and MOT testing station - Case No:
17/03918/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00012/APPFL2

APPEAL ALLOWED IN PART/PART DISMISSED

(o) **88 Bolingbroke Street, Bradford**

Little Horton

Retrospective application for the construction of a front porch - allowed on appeal.
Dormer window to front and rear dormer to be built under permitted development
- dismissed on appeal. - Case No: 17/06195/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00017/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