

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

**by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 29 April 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/19/3243562**

**Co-Op Food Store, High Street, Queensbury, Bradford BD13 2PD**

- 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 The Co-Operative Group against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 19/03261/FUL, dated 18 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is "existing roller shutters have been replaced with new".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for replacement security shutters at Co-Op Food Store, High Street, Queensbury, Bradford BD13 2PD in accordance with the terms of the application ref 19/03261/FUL, dated 18 July 2019 and drawing number P(000)02 submitted with it.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Procedural Matter

3. The description of development set out in the Council's decision notice differs from that in the banner heading. In the formal decision above I have used the more concise description from the decision notice.
4. At the time of my site visit, the roller shutters had already been installed. I have dealt with the proposal on that basis.

### Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Queensbury Conservation Area.

### Reasons

6. The appeal site lies within the Queensbury Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The CA covers

the historic core of Queensbury village and includes a mix of residential and commercial buildings.

7. The building is large single storey, flat roofed, purpose-built retail unit, with an adjacent car park, located in a mixed residential and commercial area. The building is characterised by large expanses of masonry walling and in the context of the size of the building, has a relatively limited area of glazing. The Council has identified that the building makes a negative contribution to the character of the CA. The proposal is for roller shutters covering the entrance door, which faces the car park, and the glazed part of the retail frontage, which fronts High Street.
8. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'A Shopkeepers Guide to Securing their Premises', adopted December 2012 (SPD) sets out design advice for security measures on shop fronts. In general, the guidance seeks to resist solid external roller shutters and external roller shutter boxes on all shop fronts within Bradford District with a general presumption against their use on principal elevations of properties within Conservation Areas. The solid roller shutters proposed in this case are therefore contrary to the guidance in the SPD.
9. I note and share the Council's concern regarding the appearance of blank retail frontages when the shutters are closed. However, in this particular case, the glazed area, and consequently the shutters, do not dominate the whole building and in comparison to the size of the building are limited in their extent. Additionally, the external boxes do not appear bulky in the context of the building as a whole. Moreover, the roller shutters replace previously installed solid security shutters and as such do not cause any greater harm to the appearance of the building, or that of the surrounding area, than the previously installed shutters.
10. Taking into account the above matters, the shutters do not appear out of character or detract from the appearance of the host property and moreover have neutral impact on the CA. Therefore, the proposal preserves the character and appearance of the CA. As such, they do not conflict with Policies DS1, DS3 or EN3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) and would meet the statutory requirement of the Act as set out above. In addition, for the above reasons the proposal would not cause harm to the significance to the CA and therefore accords with the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Conditions**

11. No conditions have been suggested by the parties and, given that the proposal is retrospective, none are necessary.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

*Hilary Senior*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

*Susan Ashworth*

INSPECTOR