

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2022

**by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 October 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/22/3302972**

**88 Moore Avenue, Bradford BD6 3HU**

- 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 Abdul Waheed against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 22/02041/FUL, dated 9 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2022.
  - The development proposed is changes to shop front and installation of perforated roller shutter.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The Council's delegated report states that the proposed external perforated roller shutter would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and sets out in its reasons for refusal that the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the use of internal security measures would not be suitable.
3. Therefore, the main issues are the effect of the proposed external perforated roller shutter on the character and appearance of the area and whether it has been demonstrated that internal security measures are not suitable.

### Reasons

4. Moore Avenue is a wide road with grass verges and mature trees. It is mostly residential in character with houses generally of similar scale and form set back from the road frontage behind relatively large front gardens. The appeal property is operating as a café. It is one of several ground floor commercial units in two terraced blocks facing Moore Avenue with residential uses to the upper floors.
5. Bradford's Supplementary Planning Document 'a shop keepers Guide to Securing Their Premises' December 2012 (SPD) highlights the potential negative effects that the installation of external roller shutters can have, both individually and cumulatively, on the street scene. The proliferation of external roller shutters can lead to public perceptions of an unsafe area, particularly at night.
6. The shop window at the appeal property covers approximately two thirds of the front elevation with the remaining frontage being natural stone walling. The

- proposed perforated brick bond aluminium shutter is to be sited externally within the space below the existing fascia signage.
7. Although the shutter would be a perforated design, when closed it would read as a predominantly solid structure and most of the shopfront would be concealed. The functional and utilitarian design of the proposed roller shutter would be an unsympathetic addition to the terrace, that would detract from its overall appearance. Further, when in use the roller shutter would create an unattractive and inactive frontage and the proposal would be harmful to the character of the predominantly residential area.
  8. I recognise that there are other commercial uses in the two terraced blocks that have external roller shutters. At the time of my visit some of the shutters remained closed, this confirmed that the shutters are generally an unattractive feature which result in a bland, sterile appearance to the commercial frontage. The proposal would consolidate the effect of the inactive frontage and exacerbate the harm I have identified.
  9. The SPD sets out several shop front security measures that avoid the use of external shutters, including use of internal shutters, lighting, laminated security glass and strengthening of shop fronts.
  10. The appellant indicates that an internal shutter could not be accommodated without impinging on the internal space of the café. However, I am not convinced that the photograph of the internal ceiling sufficiently demonstrates that an internal roller shutter could not be accommodated.
  11. I appreciate that the appellant has spoken to the Bradford South Neighbourhood Team and provided some crime statistics. The Designing out Crime Officer of West Yorkshire Police also acknowledges a number of incidents in the area over the last 2 years. Even so, the Designing out Crime Officer suggests alternative security options for the appeal premises, and there is no evidence that the appellant has discussed the most suitable security system with West Yorkshire Police as suggested in the SPD.
  12. I accept that the appellant has other shops in different areas which have experienced problems with crime and internal shutters have not protected the shop fronts from damage. Nevertheless, in this case the appellant is replacing the door and window frame of the shopfront and has the opportunity to implement some of the measures suggested in the SPD.
  13. I saw the commercial premises on Beacon Road during my site visit. I note that there has been a recent break in on this road, but for the reasons I have set out, I am not satisfied that external shutters would be the only option to prevent crime at the appeal site.
  14. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, and it has not been demonstrated that internal security measures are not suitable. The proposal would conflict with Policy DS5 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2017 where it seeks to ensure safe and inclusive places and the SPD for the reasons set out. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to promote public safety and ensure that the fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.

## **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*Diane Cragg*

INSPECTOR