



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: 3 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3351934

7 Victoria Park, Shipley BD18 4RL

- 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 Alistair Parkin against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02362/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a detached shed to front (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's decision notice as this more concisely describes the development.
3. The application was submitted retrospectively for development already carried out. I have determined the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Victoria Park is characterised by traditional stone and slate houses which are set back from the road along consistent building lines. The front gardens are typically enclosed by low stone walls, sometimes supplemented by hedges above, and are otherwise free of built form. As a result, there is a strong uniformity to the pattern and position of built form in this locality, which contributes positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The shed has been constructed to a good standard, including a stained-glass window and slate pitched roof. Nonetheless, it sits on raised ground in very close proximity to the front boundary wall where it appears visually prominent in the street, particularly from the north. The planting that has been introduced in front of the shed softens its appearance to a degree, but does not completely obscure it from view. In any event, planting should not be relied on to hide development as it can die or be removed at any time. As such, further screening would not make the development acceptable.

7. Overall, the shed is unduly conspicuous in the street scene and incongruous in an area characterised by undeveloped frontages, resulting in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I note that some neighbours are supportive of the development, but this is not a justification for harmful development. Furthermore, whilst I am mindful that each application and appeal should be treated on its own merits, there is a realistic prospect that allowing this appeal could make it more difficult to resist further planning applications for similar developments in the street, to the further detriment of the character and appearance of the area over time.
9. I therefore conclude that the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the area, and so, conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), which amongst other things, require that development proposals are appropriate to their context and respond to the existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character and quality of the area.

Other Matters

10. While the development may provide the occupants of the property with beneficial storage space for bicycles, along with some privacy benefits, these benefits are mostly private in nature and do not outweigh the harm I have identified and the resultant conflict that arises with the adopted policies of the development plan. Nor would the circumstances and nature of the development justify a temporary permission, as requested by the appellant.
11. The practical and financial implications of dismantling or moving the development have little bearing on my consideration of the planning merits under this Section 78 appeal.
12. The appellant refers to a lack of guidance from the Council. However, that would be a matter between the appellant and the Council. It is not for me to make suggestions on how the matter could be resolved.

Conclusion

13. The development is harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflicts with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR