



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 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: 12 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/20/3254216

4 Woodvale Way, Bradford BD7 2SJ

- 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 Mrs Nadia Hussain against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00842/HOU, dated 29 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The decision notice includes reference to a fence and gates. This is a more accurate description of the development and I have determined the appeal on this basis. I noted at my site visit that the development has already been carried out.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. 4 Woodvale Way is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling of a traditional design located in a well-established residential area and at a higher level than the road. The predominant character of the area is one of openness with low walls and landscaping with dwellings set back from the highway.
6. The proposed fence and gates have been constructed in grey upvc to match the limited element of cladding on the house. However, upvc is not a traditional material for boundary fences in a domestic setting and it appears as a solid and stark structure. The use of this particular material in combination with the

height of the structure, which rises to 1.65 at its highest point, its length across the entire width of the frontage and its solid appearance, means that it is a dominant and incongruous feature in the street scene. Accordingly, the fence and gates detract from the traditional and open character and appearance of the area.

7. I note that there is some variety in the boundary treatments at other properties in the area, some of which are a similar height including the fence at the adjoining property. However, none of these are directly comparable, in terms of their visual appearance, to the proposal before me. Moreover, those properties with high hedges to enclose the site have a softer character than the proposal before me. Moreover, I am not aware of the planning status of the taller structures and, in any event, I have determined this appeal on the site specific circumstances of this case.
8. In reaching my decision I have had full regard to the personal circumstances that have given rise to the need for the proposal. I also note that the fence appears much lower when viewed from the house because of the slope of the land. Whilst I am sympathetic to the appellant's personal need, I am unconvinced that there are no alternative solutions to overcome the issues which would be less harmful to the character of the area. This, therefore, attracts only limited weight in favour of the proposal and does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. I conclude therefore that the proposal harms the character and appearance of the area. It therefore fails to comply with policies DS1 and DS3 of the City of Bradford Core Strategy (2017) which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development contributes to achieving good design and is appropriate in its context. It also conflicts with the guidance in the SPD and the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR

