

# **Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Thursday, 11 July 2019 in Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford**

Commenced	10.00 am
Concluded	12.50 pm

## **Present – Councillors**

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
S Hussain Azam Wainwright Watson	Sullivan Whitaker	R Ahmed

Observers: Councillor Arshad Hussain (Minute 5(e)), Councillor Alun Griffiths (Minute 5(f)) and Councillor David Warburton (Minute 5(a))

Apologies: Councillor Mohammed Amran

## **Councillor S Hussain in the Chair**

### **1. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

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

Councillor Watson disclosed that in relation to 2 Markfield Avenue, Bradford (Minute 5 (a)) the application was within her Ward, however, she had not discussed any of the matters now before the Panel for determination with any interested parties.

**ACTION:** *City Solicitor*

### **2. MINUTES**

**Resolved –**

**That the minutes of the meetings held on 3 April and 15 May 2019 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) 2 Markfield Avenue, Bradford**

#### **Wyke**

Outline application for residential development of land (0.1ha) for two dormer bungalows with all matters reserved at 2 Markfield Avenue, Wyke, Bradford - 19/01352/OUT

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was outline for the construction of two dormer bungalows with all matters reserved. There was a culvert that ran along side 2 Markfield Avenue and a combined sewer. An indicative plan had been submitted and the distance to the combined sewer from the house was 2 metres. The proposed dwellings would project forward slightly and access would be via Markfield Avenue. Members noted that a number of objections had been received including one from a Ward Councillor that had requested that application be presented to the Panel. The Strategic Director, Place stated that the National Planning Policy Framework covered the need to boost the supply of housing and the two proposed units would make a modest contribution. He confirmed that the density was 20 houses per hectare for the site, however, it was acknowledged that the site was constrained due to the culvert and sewer. The site was located in a sustainable location with access on to Markfield Avenue and was considered acceptable. Parking provision had not been identified in the proposal, however, officers believed that it could be accommodated and the impact on 365 New Works Road would be mitigated by the distances. Consultations had been undertaken with Yorkshire Water and the Council’s Drainage Team and they had not objected to the application, subject to conditions. The Strategic Director, Place clarified that the proposal was a resubmission of the application that had been refused in February 2019 and the both reasons had now been satisfactorily resolved. He then recommended the application for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

In response to Members’ queries, the Strategic Director, Place reiterated that Yorkshire Water had commented that the proposal would be acceptable subject to conditions 7 and 8 on the application. He explained that the new access point would now be located on Markfield Avenue, not New Works Road and that the proposal was outline with all matters reserved.

A Ward Councillor was present and began by reporting that he had not received a notification letter in relation to the application and requested that the matter was investigated. He then made the following comments:

- Access and egress would still be via Markfield Avenue and only 10 metres approximately from the previous proposal.
- No turning circle had been provided.
- The access was close to New Works Road.
- Commercial businesses operated on New Works Road and it was busy.
- The proposal would be in close proximity to a public sewer and culvert.
- The previous application had not been supported and this proposal was similar.
- The sewer and culvert were close to properties.
- A flood risk report had been provided but it only dealt with the likelihood of flooding from a river or the sea.
- No information had been provided in relation to the flooding of individual houses.
- The information was not as accurate as desired.
- A 600mm sewer crossed the site and its position was not accurate.
- A 7 metre stand off, 3.5 metre each side, had to be allowed from the sewer.
- The culvert was the run off for the nearby dam.
- In January 2019 a Council officer had stated that information was required in relation to the water course crossing site and flood risk assessments, but these had not been provided.
- The front garden of 365 New Works Road was to the rear and the proposal would overlook gardens.
- The application should be refused.

The Strategic Director, Place apologised to the Ward Councillor and confirmed that the matter regarding the notification letter would be looked into. In response to some of the points raised he stated that:

- The Council's Highways Department had not objected to the proposal.
- The reserved matters application would cover issues such as parking and a turning area, however, it was believed that there was sufficient space for off street parking.
- New Works Road was busy but it was a wide and could cope with extra vehicles.
- Yorkshire Water had not objected to the application, subject to conditions.
- The Council's Drainage Team had not recommended that a full risk assessment be undertaken.
- The culvert would not be affected, as the development would be further away, however, the sewer would be closer.

The Ward Councillor indicted that a flood risk assessment had been recommended by a Council officer, but the Strategic Director, Place reiterated that it had not been stated that one was required. He explained that concerns had been raised by the Council's Drainage Team, however, satisfactory information had now been provided and the reason for refusal had been overcome.

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

- He lived in the bungalow next door.
- The building line would not be the same as the rest of Markfield Avenue.
- It had not been permissible to build a house near to New Works Road when the development had originally been built.
- His property was affected by floods.
- There would be two houses on a small plot.
- The proposal would change the aspect of Markfield Avenue.
- He believed that another similar application would be submitted.
- The land had not been suitable for development 50 years ago.
- He believed that the new occupiers of 1 Markfield Avenue were not aware of the planning application and should be informed.

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

- The proposal would not be transferred to another developer.
- The junction of Markfield Avenue and New Works Road was wide.
- He had visited the area several times and it was not over busy.
- People parked on the road even though they had driveways.
- Yorkshire Water had been approached prior to inputting the planning application and had advised the applicant to keep within 15 metres.
- The actual position of the sewers was not known.
- The necessary organisations had been consulted.
- Heavy Goods Vehicles used the other road near to the motorway.
- A document from 1965 stated that construction could not be undertaken within one yard of the culvert on the deeds.

During the discussion Members raised concerns in relation to the water course and sewer located on the site and indicated that a full detailed report should have been submitted. The City Solicitor confirmed that Yorkshire Water had not objected to the proposal, however, they had requested that conditions be placed on the application. It was essential that the sewer was taken into consideration and its siting would be resolved at the reserved matters stage. The Strategic Director, Place added that both Yorkshire Water and the Council's Drainage Team had been satisfied with the scheme subject to conditions and the sewer would be covered by building regulations. The City Solicitor informed the Panel that as the application was outline it was difficult to assess, however, Yorkshire Water had considered the principle of development on the site.

In response to a Member's comments about the proposed access, the junction and indiscriminate parking, the Strategic Director, Place explained that the new application placed the access on the side road and further away from the junction with New Works Road than the driveway for 1a Markfield Avenue, whereas the previous scheme had sited the access straight onto the junction. The principle of access had been considered, however, everything else would be considered at the reserved matters stage.

Further debate ensued and Members reiterated their concerns regarding the access and drainage, however, it was acknowledged that the application was

outline only. It was then proposed that a survey to ascertain the exact position of the combined sewer pipe be undertaken in order to establish whether the principle of development on the site could be accepted.

### **Resolved –**

**That the application be refused for the following reason:**

Notwithstanding the outline nature of the submitted application it has been identified that a water course and sewer runs through the application site. Given these site constraints further details are required at this stage in respect of a survey to establish the exact position of the combined sewer in order to ascertain whether the principle of a house or houses can be accepted. In the absence of this information this application cannot be assessed with respect to policy EN7 and EN8 of the Councils Core Strategy.

### **Action: Strategic Director, Place**

- (b) **Former Broadway Avenue Unitarian Church,** Little Horton  
**Broadway Avenue, Bradford**

**Full application for the construction of five three-storey dwellings at Broadway Avenue, Bradford - 19/01879/FUL**

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 approved in 2015/2016 and the plans submitted were the same as those previously granted permission. It was noted that the distances between the existing and proposed dwellings was considered to be acceptable. Concerns in relation to parking had been raised, however, the Council's Highways Department had not objected to the application, subject to conditions. The application was then recommended for approval.

In relation to a Member's queries regarding the unadopted road, the Strategic Director, Place indicated that the access for the proposed dwellings would be onto Hastings Street and the developer could not be requested to improve Smiddles Lane to adoptable standards. The City Solicitor added that the request would have to be necessary to the development and noted that Smiddles Lane was outside the application site.

Another Member stated that it was a densely populated area and the scheme would further exacerbate parking and visual amenity issues. In response the Strategic Director, Place agreed that it was a compact residential area, however, parking would be provided within the curtilage of the properties. He stated that the previous building on the site had been a church hall and any use within that category could create more vehicular movements.

### **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) **Land at Grid Ref: 412521 433021 Blackburn Close, Bradford** Clayton & Fairweather Green

Outline planning application for residential development of two dwellings requesting consideration of Access, Layout and Scale on land off Blackburn Close, Bradford - 18/05381/OUT

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application was outline for the construction of two dwellings, with consideration of access, layout and scale. The scheme was identical to a previous proposal that had been approved in 2013, however, other applications that had been submitted had been refused. Members noted that the distances between the existing and proposed properties were sufficient and the garage associated with 22 Blackburn Close would be demolished to provide an access point. The application was then recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

**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) **18 High Park Crescent, Bradford** Heaton

A retrospective application for single storey rear and side extension, hip to gable, front and rear dormer windows at 18 High Park Crescent, Bradford - 19/01686/HOU

The Strategic Director, Place informed Members 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**

- (e) **72 Toller Lane, Bradford** Toller

Two storey side extension with office at ground floor and residential use on first floor linked to the existing dwelling and dormer windows to the front and rear of 72 Toller Lane, Bradford - 19/01445/FUL

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He explained that the application proposed the construction of a two storey side extension with a ground floor office and residential use above at a property that was situated on an unadopted road that had off-street parking provision. The extension would be staggered onto Toller Lane and increase the number of bedrooms from two to six. A number of representations in support of the proposal, including one from a Ward Councillor, had been received and officers did not disagree with the comments made, however, visual and residential amenity were not a concern but highway safety was an issue. Members were informed that the existing off-street parking provision would be lost and a six bedroom property would require two parking spaces along with a place for the office, however, parking facilities had not been provided within the application. There was a high demand for car parking in the area and this was exacerbated due to the junction of three roads. The application was then recommended for refusal due to the detriment to highway safety.

The applicant was present at the meeting and stated that:

- The Highway officer had been informed that the alleged parking space was a garden.
- There was space for two vehicles to park outside his property, but he only had one car.
- His application had received support.
- The proposal would stop youths loitering on the corner.
- The office would be for one person.
- Revised drawings had been submitted and no concerns had been raised.
- He believed that if the Highways and Planning Departments had discussed his application it would not have been submitted to the Panel.
- The photographs showed a garden and not parking provision.

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

- He disagreed with the response from the Highways Department.
- There was no issue with the application.
- The entrance to the junction was no different to that of the car wash.
- People would not visit the office.
- There were other offices, such as estate agents and solicitors, in the vicinity and very few people attended them.
- Friday afternoon was the only time when parking was an issue in the area due to the Mosque nearby.
- The Mosque had purchased some land opposite their building which should resolve the parking problems.
- The application had been recommended for refusal on highway grounds only.
- Parking provision would not be lost, as the land was a garden and not used for parking.
- The unadopted road was cobbled and did not have a dropped kerb.
- A change of use from a house to an office had been granted at a neighbouring property, but had not been undertaken.
- The application should be supported.

In response to a Members' queries, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that the application proposed a six bedroom property but it had been believed that the development would provide four, therefore, two off-street parking spaces would be required. He stated that the office would have a separate use to the residential property with its own access and could be sold, so would require a parking space. The applicant had indicated that the land was a garden and not a parking space, however, the photographs showed otherwise and an unauthorised crossing of the kerb onto the hard standing area had occurred. Three parking spaces would be required and there was no right for a vehicle to park on the road. Members were informed that the scheme would lead to indiscriminate parking close to a busy road and junction, however, if the applicant could demonstrate that parking could be provided the application could be reconsidered. It was noted that officers had informed the applicant's agent that the provision of a home office would be a different proposition, however, in response it had been made very clear that it would be an independent B1 use.

During the discussion the Chair acknowledged that it was a small house, the applicant had a growing family and office space was required. He noted that many businesses operated on side streets and to work from home was acceptable. The extension was not very large, even though the number of bedrooms would increase from two to six and parking was not an issue. Therefore, on balance, the Chair indicated that he would support the proposal.

In response the Strategic Director, Place sympathised with the applicant and supported the proposed domestic extension. He explained that the office would be independent not ancillary to the dwelling and the applicant was requesting a commercial space. A domestic office could be supported, however, the scheme recommended an independent commercial unit that could be sold in the future.

In response to a question from the Chair, the applicant confirmed that he wanted a different access to the office to ensure that it remained separate and he was not disturbed.

Discussions resumed and a Member echoed the Chair's sentiments. Another Member stated that the Council's policies were clear and the best option would be to withdraw the application. The Strategic Director, Place clarified that an office with access to the residential property would be acceptable, however, two to three parking spaces would still be required for a six bedroom house and the proposal would not be able to provide the required number of spaces.

**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 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**

**(f) Land at Apperley Lane, Apperley Bridge, Bradford      Idle & Thackley**

Outline application for residential development of up to 9 dwellings requesting consideration of access on land at Apperley Lane, Apperley Bridge, Bradford - 18/05446/OUT

The Strategic Director, Place gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout. He informed Members that the application was outline with all matters reserved, except for access, for a residential development of up to nine houses. The sloping site was located in the Green Belt and on the edge of the Leeds and Bradford area. The speed limit on the road alongside the site changed from 30 to 40 mph halfway and concerns had been raised in relation to the proposed access and visibility splays. It was noted that vehicles travelled at higher speeds going up the hill and, therefore, the visibility splays could not be supported in that direction. The Strategic Director, Place confirmed that the Council's Green Belt Policy ensured that developments could not be linked and the proposal would affect the openness. The applicant had submitted five points that attempted to demonstrate the very special circumstances required for development in the Green Belt, however, the site had not been considered by the Council for development and the potential development sites either side were also in the Green Belt. The Council's requirement for 2477 dwellings per annum would be reviewed and the number would probably be reduced. In conclusion the application was recommended for refusal as per the reasons set out in the report.

The Strategic Director, Place informed Members that:

- The allocation of Green Belt was a long and convoluted process and the majority of housing was located on social land. Green Belt land releases had to go through a process accompanied by a compelling case and would then be considered by a planning inspector.
- Green Belt land had been allocated for housing in the past.
- The site was in the Green Belt and had not been previously developed.
- The speed limit on the road was 30 mph along side the site, however, speeds were always exceeded. If the 30 mph zone was extended it may facilitate safe access to the site, however, this had not been part of the consideration and the application would have to be looked at again.

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

- The application site was within the Green Belt and would probably remain so.
- A decision should be made on the submitted proposal.
- The scheme did not relate to agriculture or limited infilling in villages.
- Very special circumstances were required to build on Green Belt and the Council's lack of a five year housing supply was not one.
- The land was Green Belt and the other developments in the area were not relevant.

An objector was present and raised the following concerns:

- A large number of objections had been submitted.
- The school opposite the site had objected and raised concerns in relation to pupil safety.
- The Council opposed the application on highway safety grounds.
- The comments made by the Council's Highways Department should be considered.
- Not one local resident supported the proposal.
- Those in support of the application did not live in the area.
- The strip of pavement opposite the site was too narrow to walk on.
- Five accidents had occurred since January 2019 on the road.
- The local Member of Parliament (MP) and the Council's Strategic Director, Place were aware of the accidents and the MP had taken up the issue.
- Vehicles did not adhere to the speed limit on the road which had two blind bends in close proximity.
- The filter road markings for the school entrance caused traffic to back up.
- The road could not be seen beyond the blind bend.
- Access on to the site would involve a dangerous manoeuvre.
- There were many large developments in the area.
- Parking at the train station was to be enlarged.
- The Esholt Water Treatment Works site had been proposed for development.
- The pavements adjoining the site were narrow and inadequate.
- The site was Green Belt and was for agricultural use only.
- An ancient tree had been felled on the site in January.
- The only people to benefit would be the applicant and agent.
- Highway safety was paramount.
- Vehicles drove dangerously on the road.

The applicant's agent confirmed that the tree had suffered storm damage and had been felled. He stated that the school had been contacted directly and they had asked for a contribution, which was being negotiated. He then introduced the applicant's highway consultant who made the following points:

- The scheme proposed the construction of nine dwellings which would create modest vehicle movements of seven per hour.
- The traffic generation would be unnoticeable.
- The access had been considered over and above the usual standards.
- There would not be any detrimental impact.
- Visibility splays were in accordance with Council's standards.
- The Highways Department had requested visibility splays well in excess of the standard and no evidence had been provided as to why.
- The applicant had provided the required information and there was no reason why the Highways Department should object.
- Speed limit reductions could be negotiated on the road.
- The application should be approved.

The applicant's agent then added the following points:

- The site would be available immediately.
- The Council had released the Allocations Development Plan Document in

- May and the site had been included for consideration.
- Other nearby sites had not been considered due to flood risk.
- The application had been moved closer to Apperley Lane, as it was Green Belt land and an infill site.
- It was in a highly sustainable location, near to a bus stop and the train station.

In response to some of the points raised, the Strategic Director, Place confirmed that there was a double white line system in place, therefore, the visibility requirements would be achievable to the left but not to the right. He explained that the Manual for Streets allowed local knowledge to be used and officers had observed vehicles in excess of 30 mph on the road. In the absence of a speed report, there were concerns that vehicles increased their speed as the limit changed from 30 to 40 mph and it was not believed that the visibility distance could be achieved to the right. The Strategic Director, Place acknowledged that the trip generation from the site was correct at seven vehicles and capacity would not be an issue, however, the proposal remained unacceptable in terms of highways. With regard to the other sites mentioned, he stated that the report detailed that they were unsuitable as they were defined as Green Belt.

During the discussion Members acknowledged that the land was Green Belt and noted that exceptional circumstances had not been justified and suitable visibility splays had not been provided.

**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) **1350137 Toller Lane, Bradford** Toller

Breach of condition 3 of planning permission 17/06894/FUL - 16/00794/ENFUNA

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

(b) **180 Carr Bottom Road, Little Horton, Bradford** Wibsey

Without planning permission the erection of two dormer windows to the front of the property - 16/00866/ENFUNA

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised enforcement action

on 3 April 2019.

**(c) 172 Carr Bottom Road, Little Horton, Bradford** Wibsey

Without planning permission the erection of a dormer window to the rear of the property - 16/00906/ENFAPP

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised enforcement action on the 3 April 2019.

**(d) 71 Beacon Road, Bradford** Wibsey

Petition for noting - 17/00267/ENFCOU

The petition was received in January 2018 but unfortunately a copy was never passed onto the Planning Enforcement Team. The Team has now been made aware of the petition.

All Planning Enforcement matters pertaining to this property have been closed.

**(e) Leeds Road DIY, Feversham Street, Bradford** Bowling & Barkerend

Unauthorised storage container - 17/00299/ENFLBC

On 15 May 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(f) 32 Town Gate, Wyke, Bradford** Wyke

17/00480/ENFUNA - Without planning permission:-

- (i) The installation of an externally mounted roller shutter, shutter box and associated guide rails on the front elevation of the premises.
- (ii) The erection of black hoarding on the front elevation of the premises.

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised enforcement action on the 10 April 2019.

**(g) 516 Thornton Road, Bradford** Toller

Unauthorised extractor flues - 17/00669/ENFCOU

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

**(h) 11 Elwyn Road, Bradford** Little Horton

Breach of condition 2 of planning permission 15/07289/HOU - 17/00886/ENFUNA

On 15 May 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of a Breach of Condition Notice. .

**(i) 26 Allerton Upper Green, Bradford** Thornton & Allerton

Without planning permission the material change of use of agricultural land to the use for a domestic garden – 17/00902/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) authorised enforcement action on 6 March 2019.

**(j) 27 Durham Terrace, Bradford** Toller

Unauthorised raised timber platform and supporting structure - 17/00970/ENFAPP

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

**(k) 10 Farside Green, Bradford** Little Horton

Unauthorised railings and gates - 18/00024/ENFUNA

On 14 May 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(l) 4 New Hey Road, Bradford** Bowling & Barkerend

Display of advertisements on east facing elevation of property - 18/00099/ENFADV

Discontinuance Action authorised on 9 May 2019.

**(m) 15 Farfield Avenue, Bradford** Royds

Without planning permission, the construction of a single storey rear extension (to be under enforced) and the provision of a raised platform/balcony on top; and the construction of a single storey extension to the front - 18/00111/ENFUNA

On 9 May 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

**(n) Cleveland Road Garage, Cleveland Road, Bradford** Manningham

Vehicle repair garage - 18/00478/ENFCOU

A petition has been received and is to be noted by Panel.

**(o) 15 Dawnay Road, Bradford** Little Horton

Without planning permission, construction of a front and rear dormer and construction of a single storey rear extension - 18/00600/ENFUNA

On 9 May 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the

issue of an Enforcement Notice.

(p) **11 Kingswood Street, Bradford**

Great Horton

Unauthorised dormer windows - 18/00615/ENFAPP

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

(q) **58 Moore Avenue, Bradford**

Wibsey

Without planning permission the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey/two storey rear extension and front dormer window - 18/00686/ENFAPP

On the 22 May 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised Enforcement action.

(r) **Land adjacent to 200 Holme Lane, Bradford**

Tong

Unauthorised use of land in connection with the storage, sale and supply of motor vehicles - 18/00772/ENFCOU

The Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers on 26 April 2019.

(s) **54 Foston Lane, Bradford**

Eccleshill

Unauthorised side conservatory extension - 18/00798/ENFUNA

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

(t) **31 Lumb Lane, Bradford**

Manningham

Unauthorised motor vehicle storage - 18/01030/ENFCOU

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

(u) **31 Lumb Lane, Bradford**

Manningham

Unauthorised roller shutters - 18/01003/ENFUNA

On 21 May 2019 the Planning Manager (Enforcement & Trees) authorised the issue of an Enforcement Notice.

## **DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

### **APPEALS ALLOWED**

(v) **12 Bude Road, Bradford**

Little Horton

Retrospective part two storey, part single storey rear extension, dormer and porch to front and first floor front extension with hip to gable, loft conversion and dormer under permitted development to be constructed first. Wall/railing to front and rear garden - Case No: 18/04569/HOU

Appeal Ref: 19/00017/APPHOU

(w) **149 Rochester Street, Bradford** Bradford Moor

Construction of porch to front (retrospective) - Case No: 18/02472/HOU

Appeal Ref: 19/00034/APPHOU

(x) **181 Moore Avenue, Bradford** Great Horton

Proposed loft conversion and front dormer - Case No: 18/03748/HOU

Appeal Ref: 19/00005/APPHOU

(y) **34 Knowles View, Bradford** Tong

Single storey rear extension (retrospective) - Case No: 18/03858/HOU

Appeal Ref: 19/00016/APPHOU

(z) **44 Pasture Rise, Bradford** Clayton & Fairweather Green

Construction of two storey side and part single storey rear extension - Case No: 18/05143/HOU

Appeal Ref: 19/00024/APPHOU

(aa) **85 Whetley Lane, Bradford** Manningham

Construction of single storey rear extension - Case No: 18/02828/FUL

Appeal Ref: 18/00103/APPFL2

### ***APPEALS DISMISSED***

(ab) **15 Naples Street, Bradford** Toller

Dormer window extension (retrospective) - Case No: 18/04702/HOU

Appeal Ref: 19/00026/APPHOU

(ac) **2 Park Road, Bradford** Idle & Thackley

Structure attached to front elevation (retrospective) - Case No: 18/03765/HOU

Appeal Ref: 19/00020/APPFL2

**(ad) Former Scout Hut, Pullan Avenue, Bradford**      Eccleshill

Demolition of existing Scout Hut and construction of a detached dwelling - Case No: 18/04901/FUL

Appeal Ref: 19/00007/APPFL2

**(ae) Westfield House, Ingleby Road, Bradford**      City

Change of use of existing vacant mill building from retail to banqueting suite with full catering facilities. External alterations include improvements to the windows, entrances, access stairs and ramp, fire escape and partial cladding of the west elevation. - Case No: 18/04615/FUL

Appeal Ref: 19/00018/APPFL2

**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