



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2019

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/19/3239268 603 Thornton Road, Bradford BD8 0BL

- 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 Mohammed Ahmed of Adams Tyres against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03040/FUL, dated 16 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as "Retrospective Planning Application - 5 Year Temporary Planning Permission For A Tyre Repair Centre".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. I saw that the development had commenced and appeared to be largely complete. I have proceeded to determine this appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal proposal consists of a building constructed from coated profiled metal with a gently sloping mono-pitched roof, and an ancillary building to the side. The buildings are located to the side of an existing substantial stone building which is in a prominent position at the junction between Thornton Road and Cemetery Road. I saw that the utilitarian materials used in the buildings contrast uncomfortably with those used in the substantial stone building or the dwellings extending along Thornton Road.

6. The buildings project above the fencing to the side of the existing building and are prominent in views along Thornton Road which is predominantly of a residential character. The buildings also project beyond the front elevation of the main building and this siting, when combined with the unsympathetic use of materials and utilitarian design, leads to a jarring and obtrusive appearance in this prominent location.
7. The appellant has offered to increase the height of the surrounding fence. However, this would not completely shield the buildings in views from the surrounding area and in any event the higher fence would appear as an overdominant and incongruous feature within the streetscape.
8. The appellant emphasises that the proposal is for a temporary period which means that stone or brick was not feasible for the building. However, no substantive justification has been provided to support the temporary nature of the proposal, and whilst this could be controlled by a planning condition this does not override my concerns in respect of the harmful appearance of the development.
9. I acknowledge that there are buildings of a similar design and use of materials in commercial areas near to Cemetery Road. However the proposed buildings are primarily viewed within the more residential context of Thornton Road, and the existence of similar buildings in the wider area does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the harm arising from the appeal proposal.
10. I note that the proposal would generate employment, including apprenticeships, and would aid in the recycling of tyres. However, I consider these benefits could be provided in a building of a more appropriate siting and design and these matters do not therefore outweigh the harm arising from the proposal.
11. There are a number of advertisements on the building and the fence which add to the obtrusive and garish appearance of the site. However, the appellant has offered to remove the signs and as this could be ensured by a condition then this does not weigh against the proposal.
12. I conclude that due to its siting, design and use of materials the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore not comply with Policies DS1, DS3, DS5 and SC9 of the Council's Core Strategy 2017 which seek to ensure that development proposals contribute to achieving good design and high quality places in the urban environment.
13. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR