



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2025

**by E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 2 April 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3355432**

**10 Northcote Road, Bradford BD2 4QH**

- 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 Ahsam Iqbal against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/02499/HOU.
  - The development proposed is boundary wall and sliding gates.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Although 'retrospective' and 'resubmission of 23/03899/HOU' were included in the description on the application form and the decision notice, I have not included them in my heading as they are not a form of development. I observed on my site visit that a wall and gates are in situ. The application form confirms this was completed in 2023. I have based my assessment on the proposed development, which is a lowering of elements of the in situ wall as shown on the submitted plans.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on a busy thoroughfare in a largely residential area. On this part of Northcote Road, modern terraced properties form a relatively strong building line, set back behind gardens. Boundary treatments in the vicinity consist of low walls and fences, that contribute to a sense of spaciousness. Whilst the opposite side of the road is more verdant, the low frontage boundary treatments provide visual continuity throughout this character area. Further north, the pattern of development changes, but in general low frontage walls predominate.
4. The appeal site sits at the end of the run of modern terraced properties, at the point where the pattern of development changes. Ground levels begin to slope down towards smaller cottages that are set back from the road. Consequently, the front, and part of the side boundary treatments of the appeal site, are particularly prominent.
5. The proposed boundary wall and sliding gates would be overly tall and would be punctuated by piers and dark grey panels. Their appearance and height would

detract from the simple and unassuming prevailing boundary treatments in the vicinity and would not correspond sympathetically to the change in levels around the wall corner. The step in height from the surrounding walls to the gate piers, would also over-emphasise the height of the entrance feature. Furthermore, the solidity and height of the proposal would enclose the front garden to a degree that erodes the sense of spaciousness within the terrace row. I note the appellant's point in respect of ground levels within the site, however this does not outweigh my concerns in respect of the discordant appearance of the wall and its impact on the character and appearance of the area.

6. I note that several houses within the character area, incorporate tall hedges in order to enclose front gardens, particularly within the row opposite the appeal site. However, these provide a natural, soft, and pleasant appearance that contribute to the character of the area. They are generally set above low stone walls, thus providing continuity in the street scene.
7. I have also taken account of other example locations provided by the appellant. Whilst I acknowledge there is some variety in boundary treatments evident in the wider area, these are generally where character changes. I have given greatest weight to those that exist closest to the appeal site, as they play a more important role in establishing the immediate context. I note in particular that 13 Northcote Road has similarities with the appeal proposal, however its discordant appearance reinforces my concerns. Accordingly, the examples given do not lead me to a different view on this main issue.
8. For these reasons I conclude that the boundary wall and sliding gates 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, (2017). These policies seek to achieve good design informed by an understanding of the site and its context, amongst other things.

### **Other Matters**

9. I understand the appellant's wish for privacy in the interests of wellbeing for the household, and security, to protect against crime. These are issues that are important design considerations, reflected in local and national planning policies. I have little evidence before me to suggest that other less visually prominent outdoor spaces within the appeal site cannot achieve adequate levels of privacy that are normal for a residential area of this nature. Similarly, there is little evidence to demonstrate that security measures cannot be achieved through other less visually harmful means. I therefore attribute less weight to these matters.
10. The appellant refers to a previous boundary wall of similar height, however little evidence of this wall's height and appearance has been presented to me. In addition, an absence of objections in relation to a previous boundary treatment is not justification for a similar enclosure.

### **Conclusion**

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

*E Heron*

INSPECTOR