



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3355794

52 Saxton Avenue, Bradford BD6 3SQ

- 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 Mark Watson against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02011/HOU.
 - The development proposed is outbuilding/shed to the front side of the property.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. Saxton Avenue is within a residential area characterised predominantly by two- and single-storey semi-detached houses constructed from brindle bricks with red concrete tiled roofs. Houses are evenly spaced within plots with modest front and rear gardens. Areas of public open space create a sense of openness and allow visibility between rows of houses.
4. The appeal property is in a prominent position, adjacent to and opposite public open spaces. The front and side garden spaces are laid to hardstanding with a lawned garden to the rear. The front boundary is partly open to the street and partly defined by low, metal palisade fencing and gates. The side boundary is defined by taller, metal palisade fencing. As such, the front of the property has an open appearance with the front elevation, and row of houses beyond, visible from the street, adjacent public open space and wider area.
5. The proposed outbuilding would be located forward of the front elevation of the house. It would occupy a substantial portion of the front garden and would be a highly prominent addition to the property. The proposed outbuilding would disrupt and have a harmful effect on the established building line along the front of the row of semi-detached dwellings. Furthermore, the mass of the proposed outbuilding would have a harmful effect on the openness of the frontage of the appeal property and street. While the scale of the proposed outbuilding may be considered proportionate to the appeal property as a whole, sited as proposed it would be a dominant addition to the property when viewed from the street.
6. The proposed outbuilding would be constructed from timber with black roofing material. However, timber buildings are not prominent or characteristic elements of the

area. As such, the proposed outbuilding would be a conspicuous and incongruous addition that would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

7. While small timber sheds and outbuildings may be considered appropriate within a residential area they are generally located to the rear or side of properties as is the case in this area. The materials proposed would weather over time or could be finished in an appropriate colour. However, the textural and tonal nature of timber, regardless of age or colour, would remain at odds with the use of brick as the predominant building material in the area.
8. The appellant argues that residential paraphernalia, including sheds, outdoor seating and play equipment, is characteristic of the area. However, I saw little evidence of such elements and insufficient to be considered characteristic. In any case, domestic paraphernalia such as seating and play equipment is ephemeral and often outside the scope of planning control. Furthermore, the presence of any permanent structures within the front gardens of properties in the area is not directly comparable to the context of the appeal development before me. As such, I have considered this appeal on its merits.
9. I note the appellant's reference to the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, the harm identified above would go against the principles of sustainable development.
10. Taking the above into account, I conclude that the proposed development would result in a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Hence, it would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document, July 2017, which seek, among other things, that development should be informed by a good understanding of the site and its context and be appropriate to that context in terms of layout and materials.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR