
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/16/3161729

Rose & Crown, 199 Westgate, Bradford BD1 3AD.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Admiral Taverns Ltd against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/05351/FUL, dated 29 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the installation of solid metal roller shutters over windows to the side.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The description of development set out above is taken from the appeal form. Although differing slightly from the application made to the Council it accurately reflects the proposal before me.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the impact of the proposed shutters on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

Reasons

4. I have noted that the main reason for the application to install external shutters is to provide security measures following attempted break-ins at the premises. I completely understand the desire to improve security. In this case, though, I have not been given any information that alternative security measures would not prove just as effective.
5. The Council has produced supplementary planning guidance relating to the provision of security shutters for shops, and it is reasonable to apply this to a public house by analogy. The guidance makes it clear that solid external shutters will not be supported because of their deadening impact and the creation of an unwelcoming impact on the locality. The guidance also indicates that any proposal to install open lattice type shutters externally will need to be justified by an explanation as to why internal security measures are not suitable.

6. In this instance, in considering the particular proposal before me, I have noted that other premises nearby are equipped with external shutters. Even so I agree with the Council that the shutters proposed here would add an unwelcome element to the side elevation of the premises. Whilst the shutters would only be applied to 3 ground floor windows these are prominent on the approach from the city centre. When in use they would add an unwelcoming visual component and add a fortress like element to the building. This would be at odds with the simple and typical public house architecture of the building and would detract from its appearance. The shutters would also add to the general visually deadening effect of other shutters in the area.
7. Taking this matter in the round I have not been provided with information which justifies the use of these shutters. I have no information that internal shutters in combination with other security measures would be either unsuitable or unachievable. The adverse impact on the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings lead me to conclude that the proposal would be in conflict with development plan policies designed to ensure high quality design (Policies D1, UR3 and D11). There is also conflict with supplementary guidance.
8. I have referred above to the existence of other external shutters in the locality. However I do not know the circumstances of their installation, and in any event it would not be acceptable to add to the number of such installations without the justification required by guidance.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR