



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3354559

21-22 Azealea Court, Barkerend, Bradford, BD3 0SH

- 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 Zita Miah against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02166/HOU.
 - The development proposed is single storey infill rear extension and rear boundary wall to public footpath.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit I saw that a wall has recently been installed around the rear boundary of the appeal property. The wall that I noted on site does not correspond to the appeal proposal, it is staggered in height with brick piers protruding above the level of the concrete block walling panels. Many sections are taller than 1.8 metres. The application form states that the development had not started or been completed at the time of submission, and no reference is made to an existing wall in the appeal statement. For the avoidance of doubt, I have made my decision based on the plans before me.

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 within a wider residential area, which has differing characters, corresponding to the age of development. Azealea Court is a small relatively modern housing estate. At its farthest end, close to the appeal property, a narrow alleyway provides connectivity with Boldshay Street and Lonsdale Street. Within these streets houses generally front the road, behind low, boundary features of a mix of stone, fencing and some concrete block walls. The entrance to the alley is prominent in this street scene as it is marked by a run of a taller boundary treatments, is positioned at the outward bend of the road, and there is a pronounced apex in the boundary wall associated with the appeal property.
5. There is no line-of-sight from one end of the alley to the other and there is a strong sense of being in an enclosed space for this reason. The prevailing timber

boundary fence panels positioned at a relatively regular height, corresponding to the land slope, soften the sense of enclosure of this through-route to some extent.

6. The rear boundary treatment of the appeal property is prominent within the street scene of Boldshay Street and Lonsdale Street and the alley. The photographic evidence shows that prior to the construction of the existing wall, it had timber fencing, erected in staggered panels corresponding with the slope of the land. Despite some panels needing repair at the time the image was taken, the fencing sat comfortably within the street scene as it reflected the prevailing heights and soft appearance of the closest boundary features.
7. As shown on the elevation drawings provided, the proposed block wall panels separated by piers, would be constructed at a consistent height along the site's two boundaries. The constant level alignment would fail to respond positively to prevailing ground levels, nor would it reflect the prevailing heights of the run of fencing along most of the alley. It would therefore be a harmful and discordant feature within the street scene and would fail to soften the sense of enclosure within the alley. Moreover, it is difficult to see how the proposed walling could be constructed in the manner shown, without detriment to the pronounced slope of the land.
8. I accept that a block wall finished with cement render would not appear discordant within the locality, as there are a range of boundary wall materials in the vicinity. The specific colour, texture, pier details, and future maintenance are matters that could be secured by a condition of planning permission. However, notwithstanding my findings in relation to materials, overall, the proposal, in terms of its alignment and height, would be an alien feature at odds with the prevailing character of the street scene.
9. The rear elevation of the appeal property is visible within the street scene of Boldshay Street and Lonsdale Street, but is stepped back behind the garden, and at a lower level. On the evidence before me, the balcony element would have a slender appearance and would be framed by the gable features. The ground floor infill extension would feature a long run of glazed doors, but these would be largely hidden from view behind a boundary treatment. As such the rear extension would be a subservient addition that would not harm the character and appearance of the locality, and I note the Council raised no concerns in this respect.
10. On that basis, I had considered a split decision. However, I consider that the two elements of the overall development are indivisible from one another. A boundary treatment is required in order to provide visual relief from the ground floor window detail, which would otherwise be a prominent and distracting feature when viewed from Boldshay Street and the alley.
11. Accordingly, for the reasons given above in relation to the boundary wall, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the development conflicts with policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document, (adopted July 2017), that seek to achieve good design and high quality places by responding to and complementing the local context.

Other Matters

12. I understand the appellant's wish for a robust boundary treatment in order to provide privacy and security. These are important design considerations and are reflected in local and national planning policies. However, these policies do not indicate that this matter takes precedence over others. Neither is it shown that measures to improve privacy and security could not be achieved without causing harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified above. Consequently, these matters do not lead me to a different finding.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR