



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2023

by L Hughes BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/23/3314275
74-76 Town Gate, Wyke, Bradford BD12 9JB

- 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 Naeem Khan against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03553/FUL, dated 13 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is an installation of shade in front of shop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The property is a detached traditional stone building, comprising a shop at ground floor. The ground floor windows are boarded up externally with advertisements, and goods are displayed for sale on its narrow forecourt area. The building fronts onto Town Gate which is the main street of the Wyke local centre, and which incorporates numerous period buildings of similar materials hosting a range of retail and leisure uses. Along with strong frontage building lines generally framing the back of the pavement, this creates a predominantly cohesive and traditional character, with long range vistas evident along the street.
4. The appeal proposal is for the erection of a wooden shade structure attached to the building's frontage, to provide shelter for goods displayed outside. It would consist of wooden struts extending to the back of the pavement, with a UPVC or glass flat roof, and no covered sides. A minimal design has been proposed with the intent to keep the space as open as possible, allow natural light within it, and to not block the streetscape. I accept that the proposed shade would be subservient to its host building and simple in design.
5. However, the proposed structure would not match its host or the general character of the nearby buildings in materials or form, and so would be a starkly different feature on the traditional frontage. As such it would draw undue prominence in the character of the street overall. The structure would also push the building's perceived frontage forwards of the strong building line closest to the appeal site on that side of the street, as well as interrupting the

current full height façade of that line. This would also be visible as an obtrusive feature in long range views.

6. In conclusion therefore, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. This would conflict with policies DS1, DS3, DS5, and CS9 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017). These policies aim for proposals to achieve good design and create high quality places, and to ensure that new developments are appropriate to their local context, specifically in relation to scale, materials, and in responding to the existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character of the area.

Other Matters

7. I note the appellant's photos of other shops which are stated to have gained planning permission for front projections. However, I have not been presented with any further information as to the location or planning context of these shops. I did not identify their location within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, and my assessment is based on the specific site circumstances of the site and the type of structure proposed for it. I therefore find that these examples do not form a precedent to weigh in favour of the appeal scheme.
8. While the appellant references that the scheme design was chosen based in part on guidance from the Council, any such guidance does not outweigh the need for my determination to consider the scheme against the development plan. The appellant also references that they would be willing to use other materials if necessary, however, I have assessed the scheme on the basis of the submitted plans.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. With no other material considerations outweighing this conflict, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

L Hughes

INSPECTOR