



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/20/3253069

16 Paley Road, Bradford BD4 7EJ

- 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 Usman Khan (Al-Ghani Ltd) against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04375/FUL, dated 18 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey shopfront extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant's statement included a revised drawing changing the design and materials of the development. However, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and the plan was not subject to public consultation¹. I have therefore determined this appeal on the plans which were before the Council when it made its decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a ground floor commercial unit within a traditional stone building on the corner of Paley Road and Irewell Street. The building is distinctive for its articulated frontage and makes a positive contribution to the streetscene.
5. Due to its boxy flat-roofed design, aluminium-frames, extensive fascia and overall size, the proposed extension would be a dominant feature at the front of the building paying insufficient respect to the character and architectural expression of the existing building. Furthermore, owing to the open corner location of the host building, the extension would be highly visible and intrusive in the streetscene, notwithstanding it would not project beyond the front of the adjacent terrace.
6. I reach my conclusion having noted the extension at the adjacent terrace. However, that extension is to the side of the building and is not comparable in

¹ Having regard to Annex M of the Procedural Guide Appeals – England (2020).

size, materials or design, so does not justify the appeal scheme. I also acknowledge that the proposed extension would provide additional floor space to the commercial unit, but there is no evidence that the unit is unviable so I give little weight to this matter in favour of the proposal.

7. I therefore conclude that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017, which require, amongst other things, that developments are appropriate to their context in terms of scale, details and materials.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR