



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2024

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3350360

1 Parkside Grove, Bradford BD9 5LL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Syed Shah against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01950/HOU.
 - The development proposed is an outbuilding and boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outbuilding and boundary wall at 1 Parkside Grove, Bradford BD9 5LL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/01950/HOU and the plans submitted with it: Location Plan and As Built Elevations; As Built Boundary Wall.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed development is already in situ and I have determined 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 one half of an extended two-storey, semi-detached house located at the corner of Parkside Grove and Parkside Drive in an established residential area.
5. The boundary wall constructed along the site frontage rises to approximately 1.9m in height when measured from the road and is constructed of block and painted render to match the house, with metal railings set between piers. Although this has created a mismatch with the low stone wall at the adjoining property, No 3, there was already very little symmetry in the pair as a result of the various extensions undertaken at the appeal property.
6. Furthermore, boundary treatments within the street could not be described as consistent in height or appearance. I saw numerous examples where there is a marked change in height and/or design of adjoining walls. Low stone walls, taller stone walls with railings, block/render, and timber fencing all feature and are an established part of the street scene. This includes a block/render wall on the opposite corner. While the appeal wall is undoubtedly one of the tallest, the perceived impact is reduced by the effect of the rising land behind it. The

design, with higher piers separating the sections of curved railings, further serves to break up its massing. In this context, I do not consider the height of the wall to be excessive, or that it appears as an incongruous or unduly strident feature within the street scene.

7. The outbuilding did not feature in the reasons for refusal and it is clear from the Council's officer report that there is no objection to this element of the proposal. I have no reason to disagree.
8. For these reasons, I do not consider that the development harmfully detracts from the character or appearance of the area. Thus, it complies with Policies DS1 and DS3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), and the Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which amongst other things, require that development proposals should be appropriate to their context.

Conditions

9. As the development has already taken place, no conditions are necessary. I have listed the approved plans in the formal decision.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR