
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2017

by **B.Hellier BA(Hons) MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 28th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/16/3165046

10 Ashfield, Bradford, BD4 9RL

- 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 Mr Christopher Barley against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/07359/HOU, dated 30 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is replacement front and side boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The two main issues are the effect of the wall, firstly, on the street scene and, secondly, on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated in a cul-de-sac with detached and semi-detached houses on one side and older terraced properties and a telephone exchange on the other. The residential properties have a mix of low walls, fences and hedges generally at about 1m in height which maintains an open aspect along the street. The road and footway are on a slight gradient and to accommodate the slope the height of the proposed front wall would increase from 1.35m to 1.65m along the frontage. I consider the resulting loss of openness would have a significant adverse effect on the character of the street scene. This would conflict with the requirements of Policy D1 of the Unitary Development Plan¹ (UDP) that proposals should be well related to the existing character of the locality in terms of design, scale, massing, height and materials.
4. I acknowledge that there is a higher wall and security fence on the telephone exchange frontage. However this detracts from the street scene and is not an example to follow. Planning permission would not be needed for a front hedge which could be grown to the height of the proposed wall. However the appellant has already taken out a hedge to the side and it cannot be assumed he is likely to plant a new hedge. I have given little weight to this as a fallback position.

¹ Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District. Adopted October 2005

5. There is no space within the curtilage of the property to turn a vehicle and it must be assumed that vehicles may be reversed out of the drive. It is likely that vehicles approaching on the nearside from lower down the street would be obscured. Even if vehicles were reversed in and came out bonnet first a driver would have to move the vehicle into the carriageway before being able to see to the right. The proposed wall height would also obscure a child on the footway. I find that the proposal would be materially detrimental to road safety and contrary to the provisions of UDP Policy TM19A.
6. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Bern Hellier

INSPECTOR