



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 February 2021

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/20/3263242

Holmewood Social Club, Broadstone Way, Bradford, BD4 9DY

- 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 J Cordingley (Crag Investments Ltd) against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/05300/FUL, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing social club and erection of single storey convenience food store for Heron Foods and 3 ancillary shop units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr J Cordingley (Crag Investments Ltd) against City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the vitality and viability of the Holme Wood Local Centre.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located partially inside the defined Local Centre, with the footprint of the existing social club being within its boundary. However, the remainder of the appeal site falls outside of the Local Centre, which includes areas where parts of the footprints of the proposed buildings would be located. This means that a sequential test and an impact assessment is required in accordance with Policy EC5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 (CS).
5. However, the Sequential Test and Impact Assessment Report that has been submitted fails to offer any substantive evidence with respect to sequentially preferable locations or as to the impact that would arise upon the Local Centre from the proposed convenience food store and 3 ancillary shop units. Reference is also made to there not being a convenience store in the Local Centre however there appears to be a trading convenience store present at the current time.
6. The appellant's statement of case offers assumptions that the convenience food store would increase footfall to the Local Centre, but there is no evidence in this regard nor reference to the other 3 retail units that are proposed in terms

of their impact or relationship to the Local Centre. Therefore, on the basis of the information I have before me, it is not possible to determine whether there are sequentially preferable locations within the Local Centre that the proposed development, or elements of it, could be located, nor what the impact would be upon its vitality and viability.

7. The Council's first reason for refusal refers to the Holme Wood and Tong Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). However, this plan was not formally adopted by the Council. In light of this, it can carry only limited weight but, in any event, this does not affect my conclusions on what forms the Council's second reason for refusal.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that it has not been demonstrated whether or not there are sequentially preferable sites on which the proposed development could be located or what its impact would be upon the vitality and viability of the Local Centre. Consequently, the proposal fails to accord with Policy EC5 of the CS where it seeks to safeguard the vitality and viability of centres.
9. Policy CR1A of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2005 is a positively worded policy which allows for retail development in Local Centres. Therefore, given that part of the appeal site is outside of the Local Centre, it is not directly applicable in the circumstances of the appeal case.

Other Matters

10. Reference is made to the visual impact of the existing social club, including that the NDP states that it has a poor visual quality. I also acknowledge that the Council did not raise concern with respect to the siting, design and layout of the proposed scheme, that the proposal was subject to positive pre-application advice and that it was recommended for approval by Council Officers. However, these considerations do not overcome the absence of evidence with respect to the Holme Wood Local Centre, and the consequent conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR