



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3370914
146 Redcliffe Street, Keighley, BD21 2RE

- 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 M Bashir against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00790/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a new front perimeter wall, fence and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. On my site visit, I observed that the construction of the perimeter wall, fence and associated works had commenced, and it was substantially complete. However, I also saw that the boundary wall constructed to either side of the driveway differed from the proposed front elevation plan before me. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the existing and proposed plans that have been submitted.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Redcliffe Street is a reasonably lengthy linear road characterised by residential properties of varying ages and styles. Whilst it lacks a consistent building line, the dwellings are generally set back from the highway behind a garden or driveway, and typically delineated from the street by either a fence, wall or the occasional hedgerow. Whilst not of an entirely uniform height, these front boundaries are generally modest in scale, in the region of 1 metre. This repeating arrangement of front gardens/driveways and boundary treatments contributes to a reasonably consistent character and appearance to the road.
5. The appeal property at No 146 is a semi-detached house that, along with neighbouring dwellings, sits modestly above road level. The appeal scheme would comprise a rendered front boundary wall to a height of approximately 2.2 metres from pavement level, topped with a timber fence to a height of approximately 0.5 metres. I recognise that its scale would be significantly less when measured from the ground level within the site, because of the elevated position of the appeal

property above the road. Nonetheless, when viewed from public vantage points along the street, the combined height of the wall and fence would be prominent and visually obtrusive within the street scene. The appeal scheme would not make a positive contribution to local character as a result.

6. It has been put to me that the overall height of the wall and fence is a requirement of a family member's present medical needs, and the fence element could be removed in the future. Whilst I have sympathy with the appellant's household in this regard, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence, such as a supporting letter from a medical professional, to justify the proposed boundary height. Moreover, even without the fence, the height of the wall would remain noticeably taller than typical boundary treatments on the street, and at odds with the lower fences and walls that prevail to most other dwellings in the immediate vicinity. It would therefore still appear as a dominant and incongruous feature in the street scene. In any event, I must also consider the scheme before me.
7. I am mindful that No 146 was previously enclosed to the front by a modest wall, and tall conifer trees that exceeded the height of the present boundary. However, this vegetation provided a softer, more natural means of enclosing the house that contributed positively to the landscaping of the area. In contrast, the scale and solid appearance of the appeal scheme would appear stark and incongruous within the street scene. The absence of any identified harm by the Council to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, even taking into account any on-going extensions to neighbouring properties, does not justify development that would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. On my site visit, I observed that there are some boundary walls along Redcliffe Street that are of a similar scale to the appeal scheme, including those to Nos 138, 140, 142, 144 and 150. However, these are not the predominant scale of boundary treatments along the road. I also have nothing before me to demonstrate whether or not they benefit from planning permission. Nor can I therefore be certain as to the detailed considerations that applied in those cases. Accordingly, these examples have not altered my overall decision.
9. I therefore find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017). These policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that development achieves a good quality of design that is appropriate in scale and appearance and is informed by and responds to its context.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan, and there are no material considerations that warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

K. Mansell

INSPECTOR