



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3363619

325 Clayton Road, Bradford BD7 2SH

- 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 Faizah Fatima against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00019/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as retrospective boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for boundary wall at 325 Clayton Road, Bradford BD7 2SH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/00019/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Sheet 1; Sheet 2.
 - 2) Unless within 3 months of the date of this decision, details of the colour of the render finish of the wall is submitted to the local planning authority for written approval, and unless the wall is rendered and coloured within 9 months of the local planning authority's approval of the specification, the wall hereby permitted shall be removed from the site in its entirety.

Once rendered and coloured, the wall shall be retained in the approved finish thereafter.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

Procedural Matters

2. During my site visit, I observed that a boundary wall akin to the proposal had already been constructed. However, it lacks the render finish, railings, and gates shown on the submitted plans. I have therefore treated the proposal as part retrospective.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site occupies a corner plot at the junction of Clayton Road and Pasture Lane, although the main boundary is along Clayton Road. Clayton Road is a wide, main thoroughfare lined with houses of varying age, style, and materials. Likewise, there is considerable variation in front boundary treatments, including low brick and stone walls, taller rendered walls, timber fences, and hedges.
5. The constructed wall includes piers approximately 2 metres high when measured from road level. However, the main part of the wall is lower and steps down the slope, breaking up its mass. The elevated position of the house and rising land behind it further assists in mitigating the perceived height of the wall.
6. In the context of the wide road and the variety of heights of boundary treatments nearby, the wall does not appear excessively tall or dominant. The proposed addition of metal railings and gates would not significantly add to its mass as they would still allow views through.
7. While the unfinished blockwork is visually unappealing, a condition requiring the wall to be rendered and painted in a neutral colour will ensure it assimilates with the surrounding area given the common use of render in the local streetscape.
8. I therefore conclude that, subject to conditions, the development would not harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it complies with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), which require development to be appropriate to their context in terms of scale, details, and materials.

Other Matters

9. Some concerns have been raised over the retrospective nature of the development and the owner's future intentions for the property. However, these do not materially affect the planning merits of the case and have not influenced my decision.

Conditions

10. Because the development has already commenced, the standard time limit condition is not necessary. However, a condition specifying the approved plans is required for certainty. A further condition is necessary to ensure the wall is rendered and coloured appropriately to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development. Given the retrospective nature of the application, the condition is worded to ensure compliance within specific timescales, failing which the effective benefit of the grant of planning permission will be lost.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and subject to the stated conditions, the appeal is allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR