



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 14 September 2021

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/21/3279811

6 Ruswarp Crescent, Greengates, Bradford BD10 0EQ

- 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 Wajid Ali (Greengates Balti) against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01086/FUL, dated 27 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is replacing 4 front roller shutters.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacing 4 front roller shutters at 6 Ruswarp Crescent, Greengates, Bradford BD10 0EQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01086/FUL, dated 27 February 2021, and the drawing No. 9345/02 submitted with it.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit the roller shutters had already been installed. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a single-storey, flat-roofed building attached to a semi-detached dwelling at the corner of Ruswarp Crescent and Rookwith Parade, in a predominantly residential area.
5. The proposal is described as replacement shutters, but I do not have any details of what existed previously. There are however window shutters on the other two corner shops on Ruswarp Crescent and it is reasonable to assume the appeal site had some form of window shutters. At my site visit I was able to observe the shutters in a closed position. The shutters are housed in external boxes below the fascia signs. Although perforated with small holes, they have the appearance of solid shutters when viewed from further away.
6. The Council advises that similar roller shutters at 2 Ruswarp Crescent do not benefit from planning permission. Nevertheless, they appeared to be long-established features and their presence influences the character of the area. Furthermore, the appeal building is not architecturally distinguished and the shop features and signage ensure it is clearly identifiable as a 'corner shop'. In this context, the shutters do not appear incongruous. Whilst they are likely

to be drawn closed for much of the day given the nature of the current use of the premises, the shutters serve to reinforce the noticeability of the shop and therefore its local function and place within the street scene. Overall, the shutters have minimal effect on the appearance of both the building and the street.

7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'A Shopkeepers Guide to Securing their Premises (2012) (SPD), suggests that solid types of shopfront shutter can have a detrimental deadening effect on the street and that alternative means of securing premises could be more appropriate. I have considered the parties' comments on the security of the premises. Whilst solid shop shutters can increase the perception of crime, which in turn can negatively affect the perception of an area's character, the appeal site is in a predominantly residential area, overlooking a pleasant green space, and close to a busy road. Despite other 'corner shops' along Ruswarp Crescent, it is not part of a shopping parade or centre where the SPD guidance would, in my view, be more applicable. There is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that the shutters have created a negative perception of crime. I acknowledge that alternative security measures could have similar or alternative effects; however, when balanced in conjunction with the absence of harm identified above, I consider the shutters to be appropriate in this case.
8. I therefore conclude that the development does not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the area, and as a result, meets the broad design requirements of Bradford Core Strategy (2017) Policies DS1 and DS3, and also the objectives of Policy DS5 in respect of safe and inclusive places.

Conditions

9. No conditions have been suggested by the parties, and given that the proposal is retrospective and the relevant plan details are specified in the formal decision, none are necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR