
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3367168

Low Fold, Station Road, Steeton, Keighley, BD20 6RL

- 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 Raz Ahmed against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01609/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey storage building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Raz Ahmed against the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant has provided a set of plans¹ which were submitted with the planning application, and which the Council has confirmed formed the basis of consultation with neighbours and other consultees.
4. The Council has also set out that additional plans² submitted by the appellant as part of the application process were used for further consultation with the Highways department. It was these additional plans that the Council based its decision on.
5. However, these additional plans include amendments such as the demolition of a significant extent of the wall along Low Fold, which the appellant considers would enable two-way access. I consider that the demolition of this extent of wall would be more than a minor amendment compared to the originally submitted plans. Although the Highways consultee has been consulted on the amended plans there may be other interested parties who are unaware of this substantial amendment and may have wished to comment on it. As well as the potential effect on residents of Low Fold, the demolition of the wall may also have an effect on the Steeton Conservation Area.
6. Due to the substantial nature of the amendments on the additional plans, I consider that this appeal must be determined on the basis of the plans which have

¹ 1464-201 P Plan A1 Rev A (Proposed Site, Plans & Elevations), and 24APR001 Statin Road Steeton Site Access Strategy Report draft 22042024 plus dwg (Site Access Strategy).

² 24APR001 15 002 Site access Strategy 20112024 (Site Access Strategy Drawing), and 24APR001 15 003 Swept Paths 20112024 (Swept Paths Drawing)

been subject to wider consultation during the planning application, and not the additional plans. To do otherwise could prejudice unacceptably the interests of third parties and consultees who would not have been consulted on the amended proposals and who may have observations to make.

7. That said, in their Grounds of Appeal, the appellant has confirmed that the widening of Low Fold will not be taken forward in the current site access strategy proposals. An amended plan³ has been submitted with the Grounds of Appeal which includes amendments such as a new boundary wall to the frontage and further details of vehicle manoeuvres. I consider that these amendments are of a minor nature compared to the originally submitted plans, and I have had regard to them accordingly in my consideration of the appeal.

Main Issue

8. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

9. The appeal site is located in a primarily residential area, although there are a number of commercial properties located adjacent to the busy highway of Station Road. There is an existing building to the rear of the appeal site which includes offices and a workshop relating to an existing business. On the planning application form, the appellant states that there are 9 car parking spaces currently on the site. However, at the time of my visit there were a greater number of vehicles parked at the site, including cars and commercial vans. These were parked on an open area between the existing building and Station Road, and this area also provided for the access and manoeuvring of vehicles within the site.
10. The appeal proposal consists of erecting a storage building, which the evidence suggests will be used in association with the existing business on the site. The building includes a number of service doors which would face into the site, and which would enable the transfer of goods and materials to and from the building. The existing vehicular access from Station Road would be replaced by a new access closer to the junction with Low Fold.
11. The plans originally submitted with the application indicated that 9 parking spaces would be provided, although some of these were not practical as they would obstruct the service doors of the building and the loading/unloading of vehicles. The amended plan submitted with the appellant's Grounds of Appeal indicates that the proposal would provide for 4 dedicated parking spaces within the site. This would represent a reduction in the number of spaces compared to the existing 9 spaces indicated by the appellant, and would also not be sufficient to provide for the number of vehicles I observed on my visit.
12. Based on the Council's parking standards within the Core Strategy⁴, the proposed storage use would generate a need for at least 1 further parking space. However, the proposal would result in a reduction of parking spaces from 9 to 4. Furthermore, given the nature of the existing use I observed on the site and associated parking and vehicle movements, I am not persuaded that the requirements of the Core Strategy represent the circumstances of the appeal proposal and in particular the number of vehicle movements and parking it would

³ Appendix C of the appellant's Grounds of Appeal - Updated Site Access Strategy Drawing 24APR001/15/002 Rev A

⁴ Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2017

generate. Even if I was to conclude that the Core Strategy requirement is accurate, it is clear that the proposal would reduce parking within the site and would not provide for the existing parking generated by the business as well as the further space required by the Core Strategy.

13. As a result of the limited number of proposed dedicated parking spaces, the parking of vehicles within the site but outwith the dedicated spaces would hinder the manoeuvring space for commercial and other vehicles. This would lead to convoluted vehicle manoeuvres, such as reversing into or out of the site from the busy highway of Station Road. Due to the effect on parking and manoeuvring space within the site, this may lead to the displacement of vehicle parking onto the highway in the surrounding area. This would then lead to an increased risk of collisions between vehicles and other highway users to the detriment of highway safety, and an increase in parking in the surrounding area which would harm the free flow of traffic.
14. The limitations on parking, manoeuvring and unloading arising from the proposal may also result in the loading/unloading of vehicles on Station Road. Given the busy nature of Station Road and the proximity of sensitive highway features including bus-stops, the use of the highway as a loading area would also be likely to lead to conflicts with other highway users to the detriment of highway safety. The lack of double yellow marks on the kerb and restriction plates do not indicate that the Highway Authority consider that on-street loading and unloading is acceptable in this location.
15. The appellant submits that a delivery vehicle can enter, turn and leave in a forward gear. I have had regard to the submitted swept path diagrams, although one indicates a 12m long HGV reversing into the site from Station Road. However, these diagrams are based on a reduced level of parking compared to the extant use of the site and also do not reflect the cumulative increase in parking arising from the appeal proposal. These diagrams therefore do not lead me to a different conclusion on the level of parking that would be appropriate for the proposal or the harm arising from the proposed amount of parking spaces within the site.
16. The Council refers to a required forecourt depth, although I consider that this standard is more appropriately applied to areas such as planned trading estates. A more flexible approach can be justified in older and mixed-use areas which may contain business premises of an ad hoc layout. However, this does not negate the need to provide suitable space for the parking, manoeuvring and loading/unloading of vehicles.
17. The Council also considers that insufficient details have been provided in relation to the proposed access and the removal of the existing access. However, the appellant has confirmed in their Grounds of Appeal that the existing access would be closed and that the proposed access would not be gated. These matters could be addressed by condition, as could other issues referred to by the Council including dropped kerb crossings and the treatment of land between the site and the highway.
18. The proposal includes a limited set-back of the boundary wall close to the junction with Low Fold, which would improve visibility at that junction. The visibility splays provided by the new access may also represent an improvement compared to the existing situation. The proposal would use brownfield land which has previously

been used for storage, although it has not been demonstrated that the previous use included permanent features which limited vehicle manoeuvring to the same degree as that proposed. However, on balance, these benefits would not be sufficient to mitigate for the harm to highway safety arising from the inadequate parking, manoeuvring and service space provided by the proposal.

19. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not make suitable provision for vehicle parking, manoeuvring and loading/unloading space, with significant harm to highway safety. The proposal would therefore conflict with the parking and highway safety requirements of Policies DS4 and TR2 of the Core Strategy.

Other Matters

20. The appellant refers to planning permission⁵ granted for a commercial unit elsewhere in the area. However, it has not been demonstrated that this represents a direct parallel to the appeal proposal in respect of issues including the existing use of the site, the adjacent highways and the cumulative effect of the proposal on parking provision. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

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

David Cross

INSPECTOR

⁵ 24/04456/FUL - Construction Of Commercial Unit; Yard At Clive Precious House, Mount Street Bradford West Yorkshire BD3 9SW