

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday, 5 September 2018 in Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.05 am
Concluded 12.15 pm

Present – Councillors

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

Observer: Councillor Kamran Hussain (Minute 11 (f) and (g))

Councillor S Hussain in the Chair

7. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The following disclosure of interest was received in the interest of clarity:

Councillor Amran disclosed that in relation to 160-160A Allerton Road, Bradford (Minute 11(g)) he owned a property on Allerton Road and had been approached by the applicant, therefore, he 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*

8. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2018 be signed as a correct record.

9. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

10. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

11. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

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

(a) 27 Ambleside Avenue, Bradford

Toller

Front and rear dormer window with single storey rear extension and basement at 27 Ambleside Avenue, Bradford - 18/02695/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that a previous application had been granted in May 2018 and this application was the same with the addition of a basement element, which would cause very little impact.

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) 60-62 Union Road, Bradford

Royds

A full application for the demolition of a dormer bungalow and construction of two semi-detached dwellings at 60-62 Union Road, Low Moor, Bradford - 18/01215/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He confirmed that the application requested the demolition of a bungalow and the construction of two semi-detached properties on an overgrown site. The street consisted of a variety of dwellings and the design had been amended in order to take into account the impact on the adjacent dwellings. The relationship with number 58 would be improved, however, the landlord of the property had raised concerns in relation to the potential of structural damage, disturbance to the occupiers and the depreciation of his property. The Strategic Director, Place clarified that the Party Wall Act would cover the issue of potential damage and it was a private matter. He reported that there was sufficient parking provision for the proposed dwellings and then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

An objector was present at the meeting and outlined the following issues:

- The building was not a bungalow, it was cottages and had been there since 1850.

- The property had been vacant for many years.
- It had been sold via auction and for renovation purposes only.
- He was surprised that it would be demolished, as the building was solid.
- It should remain as two properties.
- The dwelling adjoined number 58.
- Structural damage was a concern.
- The groundworks necessary to construct two storey properties would be extensive and cause issues for the houses on either side.
- The site was originally unmade ground that sloped and was then dug out and levelled.
- The flow of water on the site was a problem and it would cause issues for the proposed houses.
- The construction would affect local residents and cause issues for adjoining properties.
- Local residents were concerned about parking.
- It was not known why four bedroom houses would be required in the area.
- He believed that the houses should remain as they were.

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

- The existing bungalow was in a bad state of repair.
- The lead flashing had been stolen and water had destroyed the ceilings and floors.
- The property would have been renovated but it was unfeasible due to the cost.
- The old walls had been poorly constructed, so would be removed and re-constructed, which would alleviate issues.
- Party wall issues would be dealt with.
- Sustainable drainage would be installed and permeable surfaces would be used, which would alleviate any issues.
- Proposals had been revised in light of objections and planning officers' advice.
- It had been ensured that the development would have as little impact on neighbours as possible.
- The boundary lines would be straightened and made good.

In response to some of the comments made and a Member's questions, the Strategic Director, Place explained that the granting of planning permission would not overrule a legal covenant and this would be a private matter. He confirmed that there was a condition on the application that resolved the water and drainage issues and any party wall matters would have to be resolved privately. It was noted that Building Control would check that any alterations had been carried out correctly.

The Strategic Director, Place then clarified that there was a condition on the application that requested prior approval of the materials to be used. He informed Members that the scheme would be a similar height to the existing properties, there were different types of houses on the street and the layout was not uniformed, therefore, the proposal was considered to be acceptable.

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) 97 Whetley Lane, Bradford

Manningham

A full planning application for the installation of a first floor shop front window at 97 Whetley Lane, Bradford - 18/02596/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He confirmed that the application requested the installation of a first floor shop window front which would have negligible impact on the street scene.

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) Garages West of 31 Hill Top Road, Long Row,
Thornton, Bradford**

**Thornton &
Allerton**

An application for outline consent with access and layout details submitted for approval on a parcel of land to the west of 31 Hill Top Road, Thornton, Bradford - 18/01682/OUT

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was for outline consent for access and layout details. The site currently accommodated seven garages for local residents, which were privately owned and it could not be insisted that they were retained for the parking of private vehicles. It was noted that the scheme complied with Council policies. The Strategic Director, Place informed Members of an additional representation that had been submitted following the publication of the report that covered the points previously raised in relation to parking. He then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

A Member then questioned whether there was any on-street parking provision and was informed that some was available.

The applicant was present at the meeting and stated that:

- He owned the site.
- He wanted to redevelop the garages and construct two houses.
- The garages were old and in a poor condition.

- A new use for the site was required.
- The development would provide much needed housing for the area.
- It was previously developed land.
- The site was close to listed buildings and the final design had yet to be completed.
- The Council's Conservation Team had assessed the scheme and was satisfied with the proposal.
- The garages were privately owned and not part of the planning consideration.
- The scheme's parking layout had been amended in order to provide two parking spaces.
- The proposed houses would have access on to Hill Top Road.
- There were no highway safety issues.

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) Lion Works, Paternoster Lane, Bradford

Great Horton

A full planning application for the conversion of the educational centre at Lion Works, Paternoster Lane, Bradford into four self-contained flats -18/01140/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was for the conversion of the education centre into four self contained flats. It was noted that there was no parking provision, however, the proposed residential use would not create as much traffic as the previous facility. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to a Member's query regarding the lack of parking and the number of car parking spaces generally required, the Strategic Director, Place explained that usually one space per unit would be required, however, the existing building had a class D1 use which could intensify traffic movements. He indicated that the need for parking provision had to be balanced against public transport availability and facilities in the area. The current and possible use had to be taken into consideration and it was believed that the proposal would result in a net reduction in traffic.

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

Construction of porch to front (retrospective) at 149 Rochester Street, Bradford - 18/02472/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that the application was retrospective for the construction of a porch, which in essence was a front extension as it covered the whole of the property's frontage. There were a number of houses with porches that covered front doors on the same street and some similar structures in the area that had been built without planning permission over the years. Enforcement action had been taken in such cases and appeals had been dismissed or were still ongoing. The Strategic Director, Place stated that the development was contrary to Council policies and recommended the application for approval, however, he indicated that if the structure was smaller it could be supported.

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

- Such constructions were a growing problem in the area.
- There was no definition of what a porch should be.
- The applicant believed that it had been built under permitted development.
- The porch had been built as there was inadequate space in the property.
- Five people resided in the property and one child had medical needs.
- There was no space for the family's children.
- The property could not be extended, so a porch had been constructed to the front.
- People were becoming frustrated as they did not have the money to move house and had to extend instead.
- Enforcement action was ongoing in relation to the structure.
- The Council had requested that the porch be removed and this would be an extra cost to the family.
- The porch had not caused issues for the neighbours.
- The application should be approved.

The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that no medical evidence had been submitted by the applicant. He informed Members that the construction was not permitted development and the porch was subsequently larger than what was allowed. The principle of front extensions had been resisted, however, it was acknowledged that the properties were small and an exception could be granted in relation to the construction of dormers if required. It was noted that Enforcement action was ongoing due to the visual impact of the porch on the street scene.

In response to queries from Members, the Strategic Director, Place stated that:

- He was not aware of planning permission being granted for similar developments and enforcement action had been undertaken on similar schemes.
- There may be similar cases in the area and the Council would take action

where they were able to do so.

- The property owners were responsible for any development and the Planning Department would provide advice.
- Permitted Development Certificates had not been applied for.
- The property was a back to back.
- He was not aware that any contact had been made via the agent.
- An applicant would be informed that a porch could be built, subject to caveats.
- The Council's Policy on the size of permitted porches had not changed since 1995 and 2 metres was required to the front boundary to enable a porch to be permitted development.
- The building had been constructed and the planning application submitted whilst enforcement action was being undertaken.
- A precedent would be set if permitted and it would be difficult to defend the ongoing enforcement action.
- The porch had been constructed within the last 12 months.

In relation to the comment made that a member of the family had medical issues, the City Solicitor clarified that the Panel was entitled to look at material considerations and apply weight as they believed, however, it was noted that no medical evidence had been submitted.

The Strategic Director, Place informed Members that due to the size of the property's garden a permitted development porch could not be allowed, however, the Council could be flexible and approve a smaller construction, subject to the materials used. A number of Members sympathised with the applicant's situation, but acknowledged that approving the development would set a precedent and a consistent approach was required. The lack of medical evidence was also noted. The Chair then suggested that the application be deferred in order to enable the applicant to provide supporting medical evidence.

Resolved –

That the application be deferred in order for the applicant to submit medical evidence in support of the proposal.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(g) 160-160A Allerton Road, Bradford

Toller

A full planning permission is sought for the Change of use from A1 to A3 café at 160 - 160A Allerton Road, Bradford - 18/02495/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the application site was located in a residential area at the junction of Pearson Lane and Allerton Road which adjoined a busy junction. There was limited on-street parking and the houses in the vicinity did not have off-street parking. Members noted that in 2014 planning permission had been granted for a number of extensions, as the building had to be rebuilt following fire damage. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that the

ground floor had an A1 use and there was a beauty salon located on the second floor, however, enforcement action was ongoing, as the use had not been approved. The access to the second floor was via a door on the ground floor, but this should have provides access to the top floor flat. The development had an extensive footprint and it would be likely that customers would park on yellow lines in the vicinity. The Strategic Director, Place stated that concerns had been raised that the on-street parking would not be available and, therefore, cause harm to residential amenity. He stated that an additional representation had been received that indicated that the development would be harmful to highway safety. The application was then recommended for refusal, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

- Highway safety and parking were the main issues.
- The development did not provide any parking facilities.
- The building already had a Class A1 use and this would not alleviate the harm to residential amenity.
- Customers would park away from the property.
- The parking issues should have been addressed previously.
- A cold food establishment could be opened at the premises.
- The applicant wanted to open a café and serve food for the local residents.
- Residents had welcomed the proposed desserts parlour.
- Pearson Street and Shaftsbury Avenue had been mentioned as having some parking availability but were not close to the property.
- Chellow Lane had on street parking but had not been identified.
- The busy junction nearby was acknowledged.
- Bollards could be placed at the junction.
- Bollards prevented parking and had been installed at other places, however, the applicant had not been informed of this.
- The applicant wanted to open a business in the area.
- Local people wanted to improve their lives and the area.
- The travel times were not accurate and the Highways Department had made an error.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Place acknowledged that A1 retail use had been approved at the premises and confirmed that 10 car parking places would be required to serve the property. He stated that Chellow Lane was remote to the property and would not overcome the issue of parking on residential streets. The installation of bollards would not resolve the problem and people would leave vehicles in front of them. Members were informed that Class A3 use required five times the amount of parking provision than Class A1.

An objector was present at the meeting and commented that:

- She was a local resident.
- There was no off street parking in the area.
- There was a hairdressing salon on the opposite corner that opened every day until late and its customers parked everywhere.
- It would be impossible to live nearby if the business opened.

- Rubbish from nearby takeaway businesses was left in the street.
- The property had been empty and never operated as an A1 café.
- The beauty salon hardly opened and didn't have many customers.
- Some people parked on the ramp in front of the building.
- Work had been carried out on the building even though planning permission had not been granted.
- The proposed business would be noisy in a residential area.
- An air conditioning unit had been installed that was not detailed on the planning application.
- Many neighbours had raised concerns.
- It was an unsuitable location for the proposed business.
- Other businesses could be successful in that location.

During the discussion a Member concurred with issues raised by the Strategic Director, Place.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(h) 3 Princeville Street, Bradford City

Front porch extension at 3 Princeville Street, Bradford - 18/02328/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He reported that the constructed porch was more like a conservatory, too tall, out of keeping with the area and harmful to visual amenity. Members were informed that there were no other porches on the street frontage and a permitted porch would have a footprint of 3 square metres. The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reason set out in the report.

Members then posed questions and in response were informed that:

- The height and construction were out of keeping. The height needed to be reduced and the design and materials used were not in keeping with the street scene.
- A Ward Councillor had requested that the application be considered by the Panel.
- The porch door would have to remain at a similar level, however, an improved design and less width would be more suitable.
- The porch would need to have a footprint of 3 square metres to be acceptable.
- The issue was a combination of the size and design.

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

- The applicant had a child with medical needs.
- The porch had been constructed 5 years ago.
- The porch served a purpose and was a necessity.
- It had been designed to serve a purpose for the family
- Its footprint was below 5 square metres.
- Where had the measurements been taken from?
- There was a population crisis.
- 10 people lived in the property.
- The family could not afford to move and needed the porch in order to live in the property.

The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that no medical evidence had been submitted and informed the Panel that an Enforcement Notice had been issued in January 2017, which had not been complied with. He reported that permission had been granted for a regular porch that was still extant and could be implemented. It was noted that the enforcement action was still ongoing.

A Member queried why the application had been submitted and the applicant confirmed that it had been put forward on the advice of his agent. The Chair acknowledged that there had been an intention to make the porch smaller and the scheme had been approved, however, the applicant could not retain what had previously been in situ.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(i) 44 Pasture Rise, Bradford

Clayton & Fairweather Green

Two storey extension to the side and part single storey extension to the rear at 44 Pasture Rise, Bradford - 18/02198/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 for the construction of a two storey side and part single storey extension to the rear. It was noted that a similar scheme had been approved at number 40, however, this had been granted as an exception due to medical issues. In order to comply with Council policies the development would need to lose 0.5 metres from the width and be set back from the frontage, in order for it to be sufficiently subordinate to the host dwelling. The Strategic Director, Place stated that a Ward Councillor had requested that the application be considered by the Panel and had supported the proposal on the grounds that it would provide better accommodation for the family and enable their elderly relatives to live with them. Members noted that it would be possible to set the extension back by a metre and comply with Council policies.

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

- His wife was expecting twins and they needed more space.
- His elderly parents needed to be cared for.
- Other extensions on the street did not have a metre set back.
- If the extension could remain flush with the host property, he would amend the other issues raised.

The Chair then suggested that the applicant withdrew the proposal in order to negotiate a suitable scheme with the Planning Department.

Resolved –

That subject to written confirmation, this application be regarded as withdrawn and formal notification to be received by the Strategic Director, Place within 10 days and that if notification is not received then the application be refused by the Strategic Director, Place under delegated powers.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(j) 8 Woodhall Avenue, Bradford

Bradford Moor

A full planning application for the construction of a single storey side extension at 8 Woodhall Avenue, Bradford - 18/02157/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 the construction of a single storey side extension on an end terraced property. It was noted that the proposed development would appear as a front extension on Woodhall Terrace and the Council had previously resisted a side extension. The application was then recommended for refusal as per the reasons set out in the report.

A supporter of the applicant was present at the meeting and outlined the following points:

- The side extension would be less than 2 metres wide.
- The impact on the street scene was the only issue.
- A shop on the other side of the street had an extension.
- Other properties in the vicinity had extensions.
- The impact on the street scene did not apply to this application.
- The proposal would not have an impact on the area.
- The scheme would create a balance as there was an extension on the other side.
- The proposal would enhance the building and the area.
- The design and materials would blend in with the area.
- It was hoped that the Panel would overturn the recommendation and approve the application.

In response to a Member's questions about other extensions on the street, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that there were no similar properties with extensions to the front and the property opposite had an extension at the rear.

With regard to a Member's comment in relation to a precedent being set previously, the Strategic Director, Place stated that the Panel could only consider the application before them and the scheme referred to was a rebuild of a property that had been damaged, but its footprint had not altered.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

12. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

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

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(a) 1137 Bolton Road, Bradford **Bolton & Undercliffe**

Unauthorised vehicle storage & repair - 17/00774/ENFCOU

On 13 August 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(b) 19 Park Close, Bradford **Eccleshill**

Unauthorised outbuilding - 18/00091/ENFUNA

On 13 August 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(c) 20-22 Highgate, Heaton, Bradford **Heaton**

Unauthorised replacement shop front and fascia board - 17/00717/ENFLBC

On 12 July 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

(d) 20-22 Pemberton Drive, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised front and rear dormer windows - 16/00434/ENFUNA

On 12 July 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(e) 28 Bartle Close, Bradford **Great Horton**

Mixed use of land consisting of residential use and the storage, repair and supply of motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts - 15/00417/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 11 July 2018.

(f) 404 Halifax Road, Bradford **Wibsey**

Without planning permission, construction of a rear dormer -17/00881/ENFUNA

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

(g) 58A Thornton Lane, Bradford **Great Horton**

Mixed use of land consisting of residential and the storage of Motor Vehicles - 14/00683/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 11 July 2018.

(h) 8 Paley Road, Bradford **Bowling & Barkerend**

Unauthorised front and rear dormer windows - 17/00397/ENFAPP

On 12 July 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(i) 88 Clipstone Street, Bradford **Little Horton**

Unauthorised front dormer window -17/01027/ENFUNA

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

(j) Land at Providence Works, Providence Place, Wyke, Bradford **Wyke**

Unauthorised mixed use of land consisting of: the repair, fabrication, maintenance and dismantling of vehicles; tyre storage; the sale and storage of vehicles; and use as a depot for a landscape and construction contractor - 18/00150/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 18 July 2018.

(k) Land at Sandbeds Farm, Trough Lane, Denholme **Bingley Rural**

Unauthorised development - 17/00824/ENFUNA

On 23 May 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issuing of Enforcement Notices under delegated powers.

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEAL ALLOWED

- (l) **Former Waggoners Inn, 18 Ford Hill, Queensbury** **Queensbury**
Bradford

Conversion of outbuilding to apartment and parking – resubmission - Case No: 17/03995/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00033/APPFL2

APPEALS DISMISSED

- (m) **130 Jesmond Avenue, Bradford** **Toller**

Replacement of unauthorised conservatory with single storey side extension and retention of unauthorised garage - Case No: 17/04376/HOU

Appeal Ref: 17/00142/APPFL2

- (n) **147 Newton Street, Bradford** **Little Horton**

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 17/00294/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 18/00019/APPENF

- (o) **16 Southmere Terrace, Bradford** **Great Horton**

Single storey side extension and front porch - Case No: 18/00727/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00045/APPHOU

- (p) **20-22 Highgate, Bradford** **Heaton**

Replacement shop window with internally fitted perforated security shutters - Case No: 17/06400/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00026/APPFL2

- (q) **30 Sandbeds, Queensbury, Bradford** **Queensbury**

Retrospective application for roller shutter - Case No: 17/06783/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00037/APPMC1

- (r) **628 Manchester Road, Bradford** **Little Horton**

Appeal against Discontinuance Notice - Case No: 16/00666/ENFADV

Appeal Ref: 17/00095/APPDIS

(s) Car Park, Lyon Street, Queensbury, Bradford Queensbury

Detached garage and hardstanding - Case No: 17/04050/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00028/APPFL2

(t) Former 40 to 44 Oak Lane, Bradford Manningham

Variation of conditions 2, 4 and 5 of planning permission 07/01035/FUL dated 20.04.2007 - Case No: 17/02729/VOC

Appeal Ref: 18/00021/APPVO2

(u) Idle Hill Reservoir, Westfield Lane, Bradford Windhill & Wrose

Layout of eight detached houses on footprint of existing reservoir with new access road. Mitigation proposals for adjoining land. - Case No: 17/04243/OUT

Appeal Ref: 18/00034/APPOU2

(v) Land adjacent to Hannah Court, Wyke, Bradford Wyke

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 16/00312/ENFCOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00018/APPENF

(w) Land at Grid Ref 415054 434822 Back St Mary's Road, Bradford Manningham

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 16/00908/ENFAPP

Appeal Ref: 18/00020/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