

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday, 3 April 2019 in Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.15 am
Concluded 1.40 pm

Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
S Hussain Wainwright Amran Azam	Whitaker Ellis	R Ahmed

Observers: Councillor David Green (Minute 33(a)), Councillor Imran Khan (Minute 33(c)) and Councillor Fozia Shaheen (Minute 33(d))

Apologies: Councillor Rosie Watson and Councillor Gerry Barker

Councillor S Hussain in the Chair

29. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Azam disclosed that he had prior involvement in relation to 19 and 21 Brompton Avenue, Bradford (Minute 33(c)) 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).

Councillors Amran and Wainwright disclosed that they had been present at a meeting of the Regulatory and Appeals Committee (sitting as Trustees) on 14 May 2018 in relation to Wibsey Park Lodge, Beacon Road, Bradford (Minute 33(a)).

Councillor Amran 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.

Councillors Ahmed, Amran, Shabir Hussain, Wainwright and Whitaker disclosed that they had been present at the meeting when a previous application for 19 Brompton Avenue, Bradford had been considered. They noted the new application in relation to 19 and 21 Brompton Avenue, Bradford (Minute 33(c))

and they undertook to approach the issue with an open mind and to consider all the relevant issues before making a decision.

ACTION: *City Solicitor*

30. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2018 and 6 February 2019 be signed as a correct record.

31. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

32. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

33. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

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

(a) Wibsey Park Lodge, Beacon Road, Bradford **Wibsey**

A full planning application seeking retrospective permission for the demolition of Wibsey Park Lodge, Beacon Road, Bradford and permission for the construction of 4 replacement dwellings with an associated extension to the existing garage and a re-siting of the access - 18/05120/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the Lodge had been demolished, however, prior notification should have been submitted by the applicant. The restoration of the site was linked to the scheme which proposed the construction of two sets of semi-detached dwellings with parking. Access and egress of the site would be possible in a forward gear, there was a bus stop nearby and existing parking restrictions were in place, therefore, the Council's Highways Department were satisfied with the development. Representations in objection, including one from a Ward Councillor and in support had been submitted. 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 outlined the following concerns:

- The proposed development had raised concerns and the demolition had caused consternation in the community.
- It had been acknowledged that the site would be used for residential purposes once sold.

- The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site.
- The proximity to 37 Beacon Road was an issue and it would be overshadowed.
- Cars on the site would cause issues.
- Beacon Road was extremely busy and dangerous, with accidents involving vehicles and pedestrians.
- Cars constantly parked on one side of Beacon Road.
- He was not against the principle of residential development on the site.
- The number of proposed properties should be reduced, which would decrease the number of vehicles.
- Buses ran every 10 minutes from the stop and the sight lines would be blocked for the access point
- He was not happy that a development of this size would be constructed on the site.

The Strategic Director, Place responded to some of the comments made stating that the proposal needed to meet the Council's density requirements and the current layout achieved this. He noted that there would be a small projection in front of 37 Beacon Road and the gardens would not be overshadowed as they faced south. With regards to the access road, the existing highway restrictions would preserve the visibility.

An objector was present at the meeting and reported that the garden on 37 Beacon Road would be overshadowed. There had been problems with youths in the area and the Council had erected a fence, which had resulted in complaints from residents about the height. The proposed houses would affect the garden of 37 Beacon Road.

The applicant was at the meeting and stated that:

- The Lodge had been in a state of disrepair when he had purchased it in October.
- Theft of lead from and arson attacks in the building had taken place.
- It was not viable to renovate the building.
- The demolition contractor had been responsible for the required paperwork, but it had not been submitted.
- There had been no intention to cause distress.
- The application was retrospective as the demolition contractor had not fulfilled his agreement.
- The site would now be cleared.
- The architect's remit had been to ensure the development was in keeping with the environment and consider the surroundings.
- The distance between the nearest dwelling and 37 Beacon Road would be 3 metres.
- 37 Beacon Road was closer to the bus stop and they had to reverse onto the road.
- 10 parking spaces and a turning circle would be provided on the site.
- The houses would have double garages.
- 37 Beacon Road was nearly three storeys in height and the new houses would only be two storey.
- He believed that the proposal would result in less traffic movements, as

- there had previously been outbuildings with equipment on the site.
- He believed that the houses would appeal to small families.

The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that 37 Beacon Road had a front garden that could accommodate two vehicles, therefore, it was not directly on the road. In response to questions from Members he clarified that:

- The proposed houses would have three bedrooms.
- The site was in a sustainable location.
- The Council's Highways Department were satisfied with the proposal and the access next to the bus stop would be enlarged.
- The development met the guidelines in relation to parking provision, the existing entrance would be used and there would be adequate protection for the bus stop.
- The proposal met the density requirements and more houses would create issues.

During the discussion a Member agreed with the sentiments raised by the Ward Councillor and raised concerns in relation to the parking provision, the location of the bus stop and sight lines from the access. The Chair, however, acknowledged that the application complied with Council policies.

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) 102 Long Lane, Allerton, Bradford

Thornton & Allerton

A retrospective planning application to retain buildings identified as 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 on site plan 02 and change of use to mixed use of agriculture and sale, supply and kennelling of dogs at 102 Long Lane, Allerton, Bradford - 18/00195/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 and proposed the retention of buildings and a change of use. The site was situated in a remote location and the principal issue was of potential noise disturbance to the occupiers of 100 Long Lane. Members were informed that the applicant had submitted some information in relation to sound measurement, however, a written noise report would be required. The Strategic Director, Place stated that officers were satisfied in respect of the buildings and agricultural uses but there was a residential property nearby and the Council's Environmental Health Unit had raised concerns, therefore, the application was recommended for refusal, as per the reason set out in the report.

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

- Dogs had been present at the property for 17 years and they had not had any visits from the Council's Environmental Health Unit in this time.

- The applicant wished to breed pedigree puppies.
- Only one litter per year would be permitted and the puppies would be sold when they reached eight weeks old.
- The puppies would be confined to the buildings.
- The objector lived some distance away from the property.
- The adjoining property was currently vacant, but there had never been any issues.
- The site was located in a rural area.
- The applicant's intention would be to farm cattle and pigs and breed pedigree dogs.
- Both income streams would be essential for the applicant's family.
- The dogs would be confined to the kennels.
- The last occupiers of 100 Long Lane had not complained about the noise.
- The application should be supported.

A Member questioned whether a noise report had been requested and the Strategic Director, Place reported that it had, however, the information provided was not adequate as a noise accreditation report was required.

During the discussion a Member indicated that he was surprised that any noise from the dogs could be heard as the property was located far from the main road. Another Member noted that the applicant may be unwilling to submit an accredited report due to the costs involved and that the Council's Heritage officer supported the proposed business in the location. He stated that he had bred dogs for a number of years and clarified that they did not make a noise, as their natural instinct was to protect their young. Members acknowledged that the business had been present at the location for 17 years without issues being raised and if any problems occurred the Council's Environmental Health Unit could be contacted.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

That it is considered that as the business has operated from the site for a number of years without complaint, it is believed that there will not be a potential for noise disturbance and it is not considered that the noise from the dogs would create a significant disturbance to nearby residents; and, therefore, would comply with Policy EN8 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

And that the application be subject to the following condition:

- (i) **That commercial kennelling will not operate on the site.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(c) 19 & 21 Brompton Avenue, Bradford Bowling & Barkerend

Householder application for a front dormer window, hip to gable conversion,

single storey rear extension, covered terrace and lowered ground level to rear garden and demolition of outbuildings to 19 Brompton Avenue (retrospective) and a single storey rear extension to 21 Brompton Avenue - 18/05194/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that a previous application for an extension at number 19 had been refused and the new submission included an extension to number 21, which mitigated the previous reason for refusal. Members were informed that the proposed extension at number 21 would be 3.1 metres deep and this would overcome concerns of overshadowing and overbearing, however, the principle issue was how the Council could secure the construction in order to mitigate the impact. A condition could not be imposed as the extension to number 19 was already built and a proposed Section 106 Agreement had been rejected by the applicant. Additional information had been received in relation to the health of a parent that may move in to number 19, but the Council's Occupational Therapy Team had not provided a comment and if their needs were accepted, the extension would still be excessive and too high. The Strategic Director, Place stated that the only way to overcome the concern would be to implement a Section 106 Agreement to secure the extension on number 21. He then recommended the application for refusal.

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

- Consultations had been undertaken with the planning officer and the Local Authority prior to the work commencing.
- An Enforcement Notice had been served when the work started.
- The Enforcement Team had indicated that the work was within Permitted Development Rights.
- The refusal reasons related to the boundary wall and fence.
- A glazed screen 1 metre in height had been proposed.
- The street was elevated.
- The 1 metre existing wall would not be increased in height.
- The previous garage had a more detrimental effect on the neighbour.
- The fence would not have an effect on the neighbour.
- Within the Neighbour Consultation Scheme it was permissible to apply for a 6 metre extension and there were mechanisms in place to allow such an extension.
- Neighbours had not objected to the development.
- It was not an uncommon proposal.
- If the neighbouring property built a 3 metre extension then the 6 metre extension would only protrude by 3 metres.
- It was unfair that planning approval would state that both extensions had to be completed at the same time.
- It was appreciated that Occupational Therapy had not provided a response, but they had been contacted.

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

- The proposal complied with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The issue had been ongoing for 4 months, as the applicant's payment had been misplaced.

- The development would facilitate the care of a family member.
- The Council's Occupational Therapy Team were medical professionals, as were doctors.
- The applicant could afford to pay for his extension and had not approached the Occupational Therapy Team for funds.
- The waiting time for an Occupational Therapy appointment was approximately 2 years.
- Both the applicant's parents were unwell.
- The road sloped.
- There was a whole raft of extensions in the area that had been approved.
- The neighbour had not objected.
- The key issue was family support.

The applicant was also present and informed the Panel that he had contacted the Planning Department and had been informed that the extension could be undertaken under permitted development. The aim of the extension was to provide accommodation for his elderly parents and he had tried to comply with the process.

In response the Strategic Director, Place explained that:

- The advice provided would be general and an officer's opinion.
- Prior approval had to be applied for under the Neighbour Notification Scheme prior to the commencement of any construction work.
- The development was not considered as permitted development due to its height.
- Queries had been received from neighbours and the Enforcement officer.
- No medical information had been submitted.
- Previous applications had been refused.
- There was no mechanism to secure the construction of the neighbour's extension, so how would the previous harm be mitigated.
- The Occupational Therapy Team assessed the needs of disabled people.
- No evidence had been provided to justify the size of the extension and an exception could not be granted on medical grounds.

Members then raised questions and were informed that:

- The application could be recommended for approval, subject to conditions, if construction on the extension to number 21 commenced.
- A 6 metre extension could not be built without consideration of the neighbouring properties.
- The Planning Department did not have an issue with the family not seeking financial assistance for the proposed development, however, the Occupational Therapy Team would state what needs would be required by the disabled person.
- No evidence had been provided to state that an extension would be essential for the family member's care.
- Information was required to quantify the reason for the extension and the letter from the doctor did not state it would be the only or best solution.
- A Section 106 Agreement would be required to mitigate the harm on the neighbour. An application had been submitted for an extension on the

- neighbour's property but this did not guarantee it would be built.
- The extension to number 19 had been built and the Section 106 Agreement would require the construction at number 21 to be completed within a set time.
- The work would have to be completed in 2019, however, prior approval had not been granted.

During the discussion Members requested further information in relation to the medical requirements and at 10.55 am considered that the item relating to 19 and 21 Brompton Avenue, Bradford should be considered in the absence of the public and approved the following resolution:

“That the public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the item relating to 19 and 21 Brompton Avenue, Bradford on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if they were present exempt information within paragraph 1 (information relating to an individual) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) would be disclosed and it is considered that, in all the circumstances, the public interest in allowing the public to remain is outweighed by the public interest in excluding public access to the relevant part of the proceedings for the following reason:

It is in the overriding public interest that as far as possible the privacy and medical confidentiality of individuals who may be potentially affected by the outcome of the application are protected.”

At 11.20 am the meeting resumed in public.

During the discussion a number of Members indicated that they were satisfied that the disability and mobility issues of the elderly family members, as outlined by the applicant and the Ward Councillor, outweighed the harm to the neighbouring property.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

That the disability and restricted movement of two elderly members of the family provide sufficient reasons for the application to be an exception to the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document and Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for Bradford.

And that the application be subject to the following conditions:

- (i) That the external facing and roofing materials to be used in the construction of the extension to number 21 match those of the existing building.**
- (ii) That the cladding on the sides and non-glazed sections of the face of the dormer windows hereby permitted shall be clad using vertically hung slates of a similar colour and finish to the existing roof slates.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(d) 516 Thornton Road, Bradford

Toller

Full application for installation of three rear extract flues to rear (Retrospective) at 516 Thornton Road, Bradford - 19/00124/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was retrospective for the installation of three rear extraction flues that had been painted black. It was noted that such extraction facilities were normally requested to be routed internally. The main concern was in relation to visual impact due to the number and industrial appearance of the flues. The application was then recommended for refusal, as per the reason set out in the report.

In response to a couple of questions from Members, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that the initial application had proposed an internal flue and this had been granted planning permission, however, an external extraction system had been installed. There were residential properties on Back Kensington Street and other commercial properties.

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

- Planning permission had been granted in 2015.
- The fans installed were the same as those approved but they had been placed on the outside of the building.
- The buildings to the rear of the property were commercial or industrial.
- There were many businesses with the same flues in the area that were higher than roof lines.
- Internal flues created health and safety issues.
- The property operated as a restaurant and takeaway.
- The only reasons for refusal were that the flues over dominant and unattractive.
- Could planning officers work with the applicant to resolve the issues?
- The applicant would be willing to lower the level of the flues and change the colour if required.
- The building had been the target for vandalism and anti-social behaviour in the past.

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

- Flues had a pressure drop and larger flues had less pressure.
- The extraction system operated without noise, but if the flues were narrowed they would become noisy.
- No objections had been received.
- He had asked the applicant to paint the flues black, so they would not reflect the light.
- The sleeve at the top of the flue had been requested by the Council's Environmental Health Unit.

The applicant then added that there were other businesses in the vicinity that had similar flues which were visible from the main road, however, the extraction system on his property was at the rear and could not be seen.

The Strategic Director, Place reported that planning permission had been granted on the basis that the flues would be centrally located and project out of the roof, which was a requirement. He confirmed that internal flues had been requested for similar applications by other businesses and had been accommodated on other sites. An adequate level of fire resistance had to be in place and narrow flues could be installed inside. It was reiterated that the concern was in relation to the visual harm and the original application had proposed an internal extraction system. The Strategic Director, Place reminded Members that the decision had to be made based upon the submitted application.

In response to a Member's query the applicant's agent explained that the flue had been placed outside as an internal wall had been removed in order to make greater use of the room. The Strategic Director, Place stated that the applicant had pursued a different scheme but had not applied for planning permission so they had not been appropriately advised.

During the discussion the Chair stated that the flue could not be seen from every angle, however, it did stand out where it was visible as it was painted black. Another Member reported that an offer to meet with planning officers had been put forward by the applicant, however, the Strategic Director, Place clarified that the application could not be deferred. He confirmed that the application would have to be withdrawn and a new scheme put forward, as the proposal was different to that submitted. The applicant's agent then requested that the application be withdrawn.

Resolved –

That subject to written confirmation, this application be regarded as withdrawn and formal notification to be received by the Strategic Director, Place within 5 working 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

(e) 7 Thackley Road, Bradford

Idle & Thackley

A full planning application seeking a change of use of a residential property (Use Class C3) to a micro pub (Use Class A4) at of 7 Thackley Road, Bradford - 18/05281/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application sought a change of use from a residential property to a small micro pub. It was noted that the applicant owned one of the adjoining properties, however, 1 Cragg Hill Road was occupied. Representations in support and objection, including one from a

Ward Councillor, had been received. 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 property had been a corner shop until the 1970s when it had been converted back to residential.
- It would be a small micro pub over two floors.
- Two pubs had closed in the area.
- The concerns raised had been acknowledged and they were willing to resolve the issues.
- The premises would be freehold and serve cask ale and cider.
- There would not be any televisions on the premises.
- The upstairs area would be used by people 'vaping'.
- Soundproofing would be installed.
- The waste would be recyclable.
- There would not be any outside air conditioning units.
- Two full time and three part time jobs would be created.
- The premises would open from 3pm to 9pm during the week and from 3pm up to 10pm on a weekend.
- There was a bus stop nearby.
- The Chinese takeaway operated from 5pm to 11pm, there was a church and activity centre nearby and all their customers parked on the surrounding streets.
- Only one traffic incident had occurred at the junction.
- The Council's Environmental Health Unit had stated that they no longer objected to the application, but this was contrary to what was in the report.
- If the property was let out as a residential house there would be parking issues.
- The pub would not create any parking issues.

In response to some of the comments made, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that no information had been received in respect of the proposed noise sound proofing. It was acknowledged that the proposal would be a small scale business and the majority of patrons would walk to the premises, however, on balance due to the nature of the business, the Council's Highways Department had reservations and were concerned in relation to highway safety.

In response to queries, Members were informed that the Council's Environmental Health Unit had originally visited the wrong site. It was confirmed that anti social behaviour was covered under licensing legislation, however, the reason for refusal was general noise and disturbance.

A Member stated that the Council was supporting small micro pubs and the premises would be for the local community, therefore, the enterprise should be supported. Another Member concurred, but suggested that a condition requesting sound proofing be placed on the application. In response the Strategic Director, Place indicated that the applicant's consent would be required in order to add conditions to the proposal and he questioned whether such a condition would be acceptable. The applicant confirmed that they would agree to the request. The Strategic Director, Place added that the hours of operation would also need

to be conditioned. In conclusion Members acknowledged the creation of employment and indicated that they believed local people would walk to the premises.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the following reason:

- (i) That the proposed change of use would not result in a significant impact on the occupants of the neighbouring residential properties due to the small scale of the business and it would be compliant with policies DS5 and EN8 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.**
- (ii) That it is considered that local people would walk to the proposed development and the requirement for suitable parking would not be required, therefore, the proposal complies with policy TR2 and appendix 4 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

And that the application be subject to the following conditions:

- (i) That the operating hours of the premises be limited to 1500 to 2100 on Sunday to Thursday and 1500 to 2200 on Friday and Saturday.**
- (ii) Before the development hereby permitted commences a sound proofing scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which specifies the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from the site. The scheme, as approved, shall be implemented before the development is brought into use.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place

**(f) Clayton Edge Farm, Station Road, Queensbury Queensbury
Bradford**

A full planning application for the change of use of part of an existing agricultural building into a two bed holiday let. The building is associated with Clayton Edge Farm, Station Road, Queensbury, and Bradford - 18/05426/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He confirmed that approval for an agricultural building had been granted in 2014 with a condition that the building should be demolished if not used for this purpose for 12 months. The submitted application now requested that part of the building be used for a holiday let with associated parking. It was noted that residential use was not acceptable within the Green Belt, however, agricultural use was permitted. The site was accessed by an unadopted road and the red line boundary had been tightened in order to mitigate harm to the Green Belt. It was not clear how the proposal would work in practice and the Council would not monitor the situation, therefore, the application was

recommended for refusal.

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

- He lived on the farm with his family.
- An application for two holiday lets had been refused and the appeal upheld by the Planning Inspector.
- The amended scheme was in line with the Inspector's views.
- One holiday let had been proposed which would occupy half of the building.
- Parking would be available at the farm.
- No new agricultural buildings were required, as others were available on the site.
- He would manage the agriculture and the holiday let.
- The holiday let could be subject to conditions and it would not be difficult to control.
- The building would be permanently used.
- The holiday let would have the same impact on highway safety as if he bought an extra vehicle for his family.
- Overnight visitors spent more money in the area.
- The Queensbury Tunnel was in the vicinity and there were proposals to open it.
- There was a great demand for holiday lets in the area.
- Farming was not profitable.
- He hoped to operate a holiday let and an agricultural business.

The Strategic Director, Place explained that only one entrance to the building was detailed and there would be conflict in relation to parking. He confirmed that the Inspector had stated that there was limited economic development opportunities and this would be less for one holiday let.

In response to Members' questions, the Strategic Director, Place reported that it was believed that the harm of the proposal on highway safety would outweigh the benefit of the use. He acknowledged that a passing place on the access road had been mentioned, however, it was outside the red line boundary. The previous application had been refused on highway safety and Green Belt grounds and if Members wished to support the application, a revised red line boundary would be required.

During the discussion the City Solicitor stated that the condition in relation to the demolition of the building would still apply to half of the structure and this could cause an issue if it was not used for agriculture. The split in relation to car parking would also create a problem, therefore, the City Solicitor suggested that if Members were minded to approve the application a new condition could be imposed.

A Member indicated that he was concerned that statutory consultees, such as drainage experts, had not been consulted if the application was approved, however, others believed that it was an appropriate development in the Green Belt. The Strategic Director, Place stated that special circumstances would be required to permit residential use in the Green Belt.

Resolved –

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

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(g) Maharaja Buildings, Cemetery Road, Bradford Clayton & Fairweather Green

A full planning application seeking permission to change the use of 930 sqm of the Maharaja Buildings, Cemetery Road, Lidget Green, Bradford from storage and distribution (B8 use class) to a non-food retail shopping mall (use class A1) - 18/05062/FUL

The applicant’s agent requested that the application be deferred in light of a letter that had been submitted regarding land ownership.

Resolved –

That the application be deferred at the request of the applicant in order for further negotiations to be undertaken in relation to the land ownership issue; and that the application be resubmitted to the Panel within three months.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

34. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

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

REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION

(a) 38 Manningham Lane, Bradford City

Unauthorised banqueting hall use - 15/00157/ENFCOU

On 6 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(b) 31 Cecil Avenue, Bradford City

Without planning permission the construction of a single storey extension and raised timber platform - 16/00388/ENFUNA

On 12 December 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) enforcement action in respect of the breach of planning control.

(c) Former site of 26A Bierley Lane, Bradford Tong

Unauthorised use of land for scrap metal storage, processing and dealing - 16/00681/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 27 February 2019.

(d) 101 Manningham Lane, Bradford **Manningham**

Unauthorised externally mounted roller shutters - 17/00249/ENFCOU

On 20 December 2018 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(e) 31 North Parade, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised condenser unit - 17/00510/ENFUNA

On 31 January 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(f) 34 Market Street, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised signs on Listed Building - 17/00795/ENFLBC

On 5 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

(g) 25 North Parade, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised externally mounted roller shutters - 17/01062/ENFUNA

On 16 January 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(h) 8 Como Grove, Bradford **Toller**

Without planning permission, construction of a two storey side extension with a dormer extension in the rear roof plane and construction of front boundary wall, railings and gates - 18/00048/ENFAPP

On 12 March 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(i) Land East of 4 Bell Dean Road, Bradford **Clayton & Fairweather Green**

Change of use of land for the siting of a metal container and the construction of security fencing on the east to west boundary – 18/00305/ENFCOU

On 15 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised

the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(j) Land South of 5 Aire Street, Bradford **Idle & Thackley**

Breach of condition 8 of planning permission 17/05908/REM - 18/00323/ENFCON

On 20 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Breach of Condition Notice.

(k) 11 Rosetta Drive, Bradford **Clayton & Fairweather Green**

Without planning permission, construction of a two storey side extension, construction of a front dormer window extension and rear dormer window extension - 18/00411/ENFAPP

On 12 March 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(l) 528 Great Horton Road, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised shop fronts and externally mounted roller shutters - 18/00656/ENFLBC

On 16 January 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

(m) 2 Idle Road, Bradford **Bolton & Undercliffe**

Unauthorised outbuilding - 18/00840/ENFUNA

On 5 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(n) 28 Arnford Close, Bradford **Bowling & Barkerend**

Untidy land - 18/00799/ENFUNA

On 22 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Section 215 (untidy land) Notice.

(o) 22 Mayfair, Bradford **Little Horton**

Unauthorised alterations to existing garage structure - 18/00892/ENFUNA

On 26 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(p) 337 Great Horton Road, Bradford **City**

Unauthorised externally mounted roller shutter, extractor flue & extractor unit - 19/00096/ENFUNA

On 22 February 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(q) 24 Bierley Lane, Bradford **Tong**

Unauthorised mixed use of land for residential use and for scrap metal storage, processing and dealing - 19/00156/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 27 February 2019.

DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

APPEALS ALLOWED

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

Retrospective planning permission for change of use of land to a gypsy and traveller caravan site - Case No: 17/01223/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00089/APPFL2

(s) Wyke Mills, Huddersfield Road, Bradford **Wyke**

Removal of condition 3 (temporary use for 8 years) and variation of conditions 4 (hours of use) and 5 (landscape scheme) of planning permission 11/00965/FUL - Case No: 18/02644/VOC

Appeal Ref: 18/00106/APPVO2

APPEALS DISMISSED

(t) 11 Harrogate Terrace, Bradford **Bolton & Undercliffe**

Two storey rear extension - Case No: 18/01948/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00088/APPHOU

(u) 19 Clara Road, Bradford **Windhill & Wrose**

Garage conversion, new roof and detached garage - Case No: 18/02153/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00130/APPHOU

(v) 194 St Enoch's Road, Bradford **Wibsey**

Retrospective application for installation of roller shutter - Case No: 18/01828/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00071/APPFL2

(w) 29 Raikes Avenue, Bradford

Tong

One non illuminated banner sign to front elevation (retrospective) - Case No: 18/03332/ADV

Appeal Ref: 18/00108/APPAD2

(x) 60 Fitzroy Road, Bradford

Bradford Moor

Construction of rear extension - Case No: 18/04022/HOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00144/APPHOU

(y) 68-70 Manningham Lane, Bradford

Manningham

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 15/00952/ENFCOU

Appeal Ref: 18/00035/APPENF

(z) 82 Curzon Road, Bradford

Bradford Moor

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 17/00374/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 18/00109/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