

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Bradford) held on Wednesday, 22 December 2021 at 10.00 am in Council Chamber, City Hall - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.12 am
Adjourned 10.18 am
Reconvened 10.30 am
Concluded 1.28 pm

Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
Engel (Chair) Amran Cunningham S Khan	Glentworth Riaz	Stubbs

Apology: K Green

Observers: Councillors Joan Clarke, Ibrar Hussain and Geoff Reid.

Councillor Engel in the Chair

51. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

In the interest of transparency, Councillor Stubbs, declared an interest in respect of item P relating to 17 Fulford Walk, Bradford, in that he made representation when the application was put before the Panel, however, he was not a member of the Panel at the time.

In the interest of transparency, Councillor Amran declared an interest in that he recognised some members of the public at the meeting, however he stated that he would consider the applications with an open mind.

In the interest of transparency, Councillor Cunningham, declared an interest in respect of item B relating to Prince of Wales Inn, 91 Harrogate Road Bradford, in that he had been approached by members of public who had an interest in this application. However, he stated that he had not discussed that application with anyone and would consider the application with an open mind.

52. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 27th October 2021, be signed as a correct record.

53. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

54. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL OR REFUSAL

The Chair advised that the order of the agenda would be considered as follows: items, G, H, C, A, B, D, E and F. For the purpose of the minutes, items were minuted in the order they appeared in the published agenda.

(a) 20 BRACKENDALE PARADE BRADFORD BD10 0SR - 21/03248/FUL

Proposal: A full planning application for the construction of a new three-bedroom dwelling within the curtilage of 20 Brackendale Parade, Bradford, BD10 0SR.

The Strategic Director, Place, provided a detailed overview of the planning application, showing plans and photographs of the proposal. The Panel was informed that the proposal was not deemed to be harmful to the neighbouring properties.

An objector had registered to speak in relation to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, had raised a number of points, including:

- concerns of health and safety as the development was in close proximity to electricity sub-station;
- concerns to highways safety;
- concerns to work undertaken in the garden as the garden space was too small for this development;
- the proposed development raised ecological concerns;
- all properties in the area had a covenants in place. The proposed scheme would be detrimental to the development and adjacent properties;
- increase car parking to the narrow street.

In response to the objector's concerns, the Senior Planning Officer advised the Panel that covenants on a property was not a planning matter, the person seeking to enforce covenant would be the legal owner of the property. In terms of parking, the proposal provided parking spaces for two vehicles, in addition there were also off street parking available.

In response to a Member's question, the Senior Planning Officer informed the Panel that similar proposals had been granted planning permission and this proposal would be in line with other developments in the area.

The applicant/agent had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, informed the Committee that that proposed scheme adhered to all the relevant planning policies and plans. The proposal had been reduced, the design and layout was in character to the area.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

Resolved:

That the application number 21/03248/FUL be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report (Document "G").

Action: Strategic Director, Place

**(b) PRINCE OF WALES INN 91 HARROGATE ROAD BRADFORD
BD2 3ES - 21/02982/FUL**

Proposal: A full planning application for the construction of a new roadside service station with canopy and ancillary parking at 91 Harrogate Road, Bradford, BD2 3ES.

The Strategic Director, Place, provided a detailed overview of the planning application, showing plans and photographs of the proposal.

Members noted the objector's concerns, it was stated that the development would increase traffic to existing high traffic volume on a busy road. The proposed development would have a direct impact in terms of noise, air and light pollution of several homes, as well as having a negative impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Councillor Geoff Reid had registered to speak, and at the requested of the Chair, reiterated the objector's concerns'. He stressed that the proposed scheme was not suitable for this site, it was a very busy junction and a primary school nearby, adding if the application was granted it would only increase further issues.

In response to a Member's question, the Highways Officer clarified that the proposed development of the petrol filling station would likely draw the majority of its trade from passing vehicle traffic, therefore, Highways had no objections to the development. The bus stop was to be moved further away from the junction of Harrogate Road to the front of the nearby parade of shops, this had been agreed by WYCA and the Council's Highway Officer. The relocation of the bus stop was at the developers' expense.

The Senior Planning Officer clarified that the site was a former public house, the building had since been demolished. Members noted that previous plans to the site, including a dental practice had not gone ahead. He further stressed that any development on the site would generate traffic.

The applicant and agent had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair addressed the Panel that the site had been vacant for some time. The development was for a petrol station consisting of a small shops and two Electric Vehicle Charging Points on the site. Whilst the development would create jobs it would improve an eyesore site, one that regularly attracts anti-social behaviour and fly tipping. The proposed scheme was not deemed to be harmful to the immunity to the neighbouring proprietries.

In response to the Panel, the applicant stated the development would be a "top up" shop that would be used by patrons whilst fuelling their cars.

During a detailed discussion, whilst Members acknowledged that this was a vacant site and the site required a good business use, however, some Members felt they could not support the application as they had concerns with regards to the implication of the proposed scheme, in terms of, traffic issues, pedestrians' safety and the site was located by nearby school.

A motion for deferral was put forward by the Panel for the reason that there were concerns in relation to highways safety.

Resolved:

That the application number 21/02982/FUL be deferred pending a comprehensive Highways Safety Assessment Report to be carried out and to be submitted to the Panel.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(c) REDBECK RABBIT BOARDING 48 CALDENE AVENUE BRADFORD, BD12 0JP - 21/04676/FUL

Proposal: A retrospective planning application for change of use of domestic garden to small animal boarding business (Sui Generis), retention of a number of small purpose built wooden sheds and secure enclosures (8 small sheds) at 48 Caldene Avenue, Bradford, BD12 0JP.

The Strategic Director, Place, provided a detailed overview of a retrospective planning application, showing plans and photographs of the proposal. Members were informed that six letters of objections and 50 letters of support had been received, these were highlighted in the report.

During the debate Members' raised and number of questions and comments. The Planning Officer addressed the following points, including:

- the two off-street parking was residential parking spaces;
- the applicant had submitted a Pest Management Plan and no objections had been raised by Environmental Health;
- the objections received raised concerns regarding both the commercial use of the business and an influx of vermin and flies to the neighbouring properties;
- it was stated that the establishment was a small scale of business and was well kept. The business was no different to any other business in a residential setting;
- Planning permission was sought due to the scale of the proposal.

Councillor David Warburton had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, raised a number of concerns. He stated that this was a retrospective business without planning permission. The proposal failed to meet the Council's Core Strategy Policies as well as poor design for the area. Furthermore, the proposal had a detrimental impact on the eleven nearby residential properties in terms of parking and pollution.

The Planning Officer addressed the concerns raised and clarified that the design was deemed appropriate for the nature of this business. There was limited views of the establishment from the public viewpoints and was not harmful to the immunity.

Councillor Joan Clarke had registered to speak in support of the application, and at the request of the Chair, stated that she had visited the property and seen no concerns relating to vermin or flies. Whilst the Sheds and huts were well maintained, the garden also had LED lights which was not harmful to the neighbouring. In addition, the business offered a click and collect service, therefore, there would be no significant increase to the traffic.

The applicant had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, stated that whilst the business had been operating for three years, during the pandemic the business had been closed. He stated that this was a well-run business, the animals were well kept and any vermin and flies were monitored frequently. Furthermore, LED solar panel lighting were used and was not deemed to be harmful to the overlooking or overshadowing to the neighbouring properties. All health and safety measures were put in place to alleviate any issues.

The Panel was in support of the proposed application and recognised that the business was well-maintained and was not detrimental to the surrounding area, furthermore, there had been no objections from Environmental Health.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

Resolved:

That the application number 21/04676/FUL be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report (Document "G").

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(d) STADIUM MILLS PEARSON ROAD BRADFORD BD6 1BJ - 21/04241/FUL

Proposal: A full application seeking to change the use of the existing snooker club with American pool lounge bar and function facilities at Stadium Mills, Pearson Road, BD6 1BJ to include use as a wedding ceremony venue (Sui-Generis).

The Strategic Director, Place, provided a detailed overview of the planning application, showing plans and photographs of the proposal. Members noted that the property was a former mill building and was currently used as a snooker club with a function hall.

In response to a Member's question, the Senior Planning Officer advised that the proposal would not increase the facilities size or capacity and that the snooker club would remain. The proposal was for a change of use to allow wedding ceremonies.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

Resolved:

That the application number 21/04241/FUL be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report (Document "G").

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(e) 16 VICTOR STREET HEATON BRADFORD BD9 4RB - 21/02913/HOU

Proposal: A householder application for dormer windows to the front and rear roof of 16 Victor Street, Manningham, Bradford.

Further to Minute No. 23 on 25th August 2021, the Panel noted the revised application. The Planning Officer recommended the proposal to be refused relating to poor design and concerns to the excessive size of the dormer windows. Furthermore, the proposed changes would be out of character to the area and would be significant harmful of the Conservation Area.

The Planning Officer informed the Panel that Councillor Sarfraz Nazir had requested for the consideration of this item to be deferred as he had urgent family commitment and was unable to attend the Planning Panel. As formal representation had already been submitted as part of the planning application process and was summarised in the report, the panel decided the application considering these comments. Alternative correspondence from the Agent had also been received requested for the application to go to Panel and for a decision to be made.

In the ensuing debate, Members felt that the proposal was unsuitable with the streetscene and noted that that the proposal did not comply with the policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of the Core Strategy Development Plans.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

Resolved:

That the application number 21/02913/ HOU be refused for the reasons set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report (Document "G").

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(f) 17 PARK VIEW ROAD BRADFORD BD9 4PA - 21/04019/HOU

Proposal: Householder application for the installation of external stairs to basement level removal of front boundary wall and dropped kerb to be form an off-street parking space in the front garden of 17 Park View Road, Manningham, Bradford.

The Strategic Director, Place, provided a detailed overview of the planning application, showing plans and photographs of the proposal. The Planning Officer informed the Panel that Councillor Sarfraz Nazir had requested for the consideration of this item to be deferred as he had urgent family commitment and was unable to attend the Planning Panel. As formal representation had already been submitted as part of the planning application process and was summarised in the report, the Panel decided the application considering these comments.

Members noted that the property was a terraced dwelling in a conservation area. Officers recommended to refuse the proposal as it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In response to a Member's question, The Planning Officer stated that the applicant had not sought any planning permission with regards to the dropped kerb and that the onus was on the landlord to get permission from all the relevant Council departments. A Member commented that whilst the applicant obtained permission from the Council's Highways Authority to allow for a dropped kerb outside his property, they would not necessarily know that they also required planning permission. Members commented that this was confusing for the public.

In the ensuing debate, Members raised a number of concerns and highlighted that the removal of the boundary wall to the front of the site would be harmful to the Conservation Area and that the wall should be retained.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

Resolved:

That the application number 21/04019/ HOU be refused for the reasons set out in the Strategic Director, Place's technical report (Document "G").

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(g) 19 SHAY DRIVE BRADFORD BD9 5PP - 21/04530/HOU

Proposal: Householder application and permission is sought for roof alterations and front and rear dormers at 19 Shay Drive, Bradford, BD9 5PP.

The Strategic Director, Place, provided a detailed overview of the planning application, showing plans and photographs of the proposal. The Panel was informed that the property was prominent to the streetscene.

Members noted that previous applications had been refused due to the height and mass of the proposal. Whilst minor amendments to the application had been made to the proposed roof form, the Senior Planning Officer stated that the design was harmful to the character and appearance to the area.

Councillor Ibrar Hussain had registered to speak in support of the application, and at the request of the Chair, he stated that the applicant had made significant modifications to overcome the concerns related to the original application. The current space was overcrowded and it was prudent that the family had the additional space to meet the needs of a growing family.

Furthermore, he stated that similar planning proposals for other properties in the area had been approved and felt that this proposal was in line with other properties.

Members noted that Councillor Ibrar Hussain submitted additional document relating to previous applications in the local area with a similar design of roof alterations, however as this was a late submission the document was not shared to the Panel. Some Members felt that it would be judicious for the documents to be shared before making a decision.

The applicant was present at the meeting, and at the request of the Chair, informed the Panel that the current space at the household was not sufficient. The applicant had worked with the architect to ensure that the design retains the original characteristics of the property and that the proposal would improve the aesthetics of the property overall., The applicant had discussions with planning officers seeking to overcome any concerns, however, the modifications suggested by the planning officers were considered by the applicant not to be suitable to meet the needs of a growing family. Furthermore, the proposal was in line with other extension in and around the area.

Resolved:

That the application number 21/04530/HOU be deferred pending additional information to be submitted by the representative and for officers to consider the additional information in order to assess whether the proposed application could be considered to conform with the street scene.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

(h) LAND NORTH OF LEYLANDS MEDICAL CENTRE 81 LEYLANDS LANE, BRADFORD BD9 5PZ - 21/04792/FUL

Proposal: Full planning application for the construction of three houses including parking, access and landscaping on land to the North of Leylands Medical Centre, Leylands Lane, Bradford.

The Strategic Director, Place, provided an overview of the planning application, showing plans and photographs of the proposal. Members were informed that the applicant had requested for the application to be deferred in order to submit further information regarding the impact on trees.

Resolved:

That the application number 21/004792/FUL be deferred pending further information to be submitted regarding the impact of trees to the area.

Action: Strategic Director, Place

55. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

The Panel considered other matters which were set out in (**Document “H”**) relating to miscellaneous items:

(AA) Item to note

(P-T) Decisions made by the Secretary of State – Allowed

(U-Z) Decisions made by the Secretary of State – Dismissed

Resolved:

That the decisions made by the Secretary of State as set out in (Document “H”) 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).

THIS AGENDA AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER