
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2022

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/21/3287861
198 Leeds Road, Shipley BD18 1EA

- 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 Stewart Fletcher against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03992/FUL, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is timber shopfront and external timber canopy for purpose of outside seating/smoking area
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the external timber canopy for purpose of outside seating/smoking area. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the timber shopfront at 198 Leeds Road, Shipley BD18 1EA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/03992/FUL dated 29 July 2021.

Procedural Matters

2. I have omitted the words 'retrospective application for' from the description of the proposal as this wording does not form a description of development.
3. At the time of my site visit, the timber shopfront was installed. This appeared to broadly accord with the details on the submitted plans. An external freestanding timber canopy was also present at the time of my visit. This appeared greater in depth than that included on the plans associated with this proposal. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the timber canopy and timber shopfront on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Timber canopy

5. The appeal site forms part of an established commercial parade on the southern side of Leeds Road. The timber canopy would not be excessive in size, scale or height when viewed within the context of the three-storey building that it would be placed in front of.

6. Further, the neighbouring retail store and a restaurant closely to the east incorporate forward projecting railings and forward projecting decking respectively and the projection of these features are not significantly different from the proposed timber canopy.
7. However, its stand-alone design would leave it rather isolated in appearance within the street scene, while the incorporation of barrel supports to its four corners would afford the structure a rather uncomfortable and temporary appearance to the front of the well-established parade.
8. The poor design of the timber canopy would therefore be detrimental to the appearance of the parade and would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. The timber canopy would therefore fail to accord with policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy (2017) (CS) which amongst other things require good quality design that responds to the existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character of the area.

Timber shopfront

10. The materials on buildings within the parade are mixed, along with the frontages, which incorporate a wide range of materials, signage and other features. Within this context, the timber shopfront would not appear out of place and would not harm the appearance of the parade nor harm the character and appearance of the area. This part of the proposal would therefore accord with the policies outlined above.

Other Matters

11. I accept that being able to provide outside space at business premises is beneficial and has been important as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. However, there is no indication that a greater requirement for outdoor seating will be a significant long-term requirement.
12. Further, it may be possible that outdoor space could be provided in a less harmful manner. I therefore afford this matter limited weight.
13. No conditions have been suggested by the Council and are not necessary given the timber shopfront appears to be completed.

Conclusion

14. There are no indications that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed insofar as it relates to the external timber canopy and allowed insofar as it relates to the timber shopfront.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR