



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2025

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3373230

2 Hunters Court, Bradford BD9 6QF

- 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 Azhar Sheikh against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00634/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use of existing residential storage building to commercial storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) indicates that planning applications must, as a minimum, be accompanied by a 'location plan'¹. The application site should be edged clearly with a red line on the location plan and include all land necessary to carry out the proposed development, including land required for access to the site from a public highway².
3. The location plan before me features a red line around the site of the existing residential storage building and associated dwelling only. Access to the site is however proposed to be taken from Haworth Road, via a narrow alley to the side of 230 Haworth Road, and this has not been included in the location plan. Moreover, the evidence indicates that this land is owned by a third party, yet Ownership Certificate A has been signed on the application form, erroneously indicating that nobody except the applicant was the owner of any part of the land to which the application relates. It is also not clear whether the requisite notice was served on the relevant landowner by the applicant.
4. The above issues concern the validity of the application, and by extension this appeal. This matter would need to have been resolved before any planning permission could be granted. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not pursued it any further.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

¹ Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 14-023-20140306

² Paragraph: 024 Reference ID: 14-024-20140306

Reasons

6. The appeal relates to an existing residential storage building located adjacent to a bungalow at 2 Hunters Court. Hunters Court is a small cul-de-sac of 3 dwellings, accessed via Brantwood Avenue, with the appeal building surrounded on all sides by dwellings or private garden spaces. The surrounding area is thus predominantly residential in nature, comprising a mix of mostly detached and semi-detached dwellings, albeit with a short row of commercial units immediately to the south-east of the appeal site and other sporadic commercial uses along Haworth Road.
7. The proposal seeks to change the use of the building from a residential storage use to a commercial use to support an existing business located in the parade of shops to the south-east of the site. As set out above, access would be taken via the existing alley between the commercial unit at 230 Haworth Road and the neighbouring dwelling at 234 Haworth Road.
8. No technical assessment of noise levels associated with the change of use or the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties has been provided. Likewise, there is no details of any mitigation measures that have been or would be implemented to alleviate any increase in noise or disturbance.
9. The evidence indicates that the appellant's shop has opening hours of 9am-7pm Monday – Saturday and 10am-6pm on Sundays. Deliveries are received on weekday mornings (Monday – Thursday) with, on average, a couple of deliveries per week. Pallet movements by an electric forklift to and from the appeal building are, on average, once or twice per day, during shop opening hours.
10. The exact time of morning deliveries is however unclear from the evidence, and the frequency of pallet movements within external areas in proximity to No 234 and other residential properties, which occur every day of the week including on Sundays, is not insignificant. Activity across external areas associated with the commercial storage use of the building, including pallet movements and opening and closing of the shutter door, as well as noise from activity inside the building, is likely to result in increased noise and disturbance for neighbouring occupiers.
11. The typical frequency of deliveries and the level and type of activity in and around the building is noted, and planning conditions could be used to control the use of the building to some extent. However, the external areas next to the building and neighbouring properties are beyond the site boundary, and the evidence suggests that at least some of this land is not within the appellant's ownership. The ability to regulate the activity within these areas associated with the commercial storage use of the building is thus somewhat limited. There is otherwise no mechanism before me that would secure adequate controls on the use of the building and the alleyway adjacent to No 234 or other external areas.
12. While other commercial units next to the site may have longer and/or later opening hours than those of the business to which the appeal scheme relates, it is not clear that the external activity associated with these neighbouring units is comparable to that in the appeal scheme. Moreover, the appeal development relates to a building more closely surrounded by residential properties than the neighbouring units.
13. Based on the evidence before me, the development is harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to noise and disturbance. It is contrary to Policies DS5 and EN8 of the Bradford

District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) Adopted July 2017. These policies, among other provisions, seek to ensure that development proposals make a positive contribution to people's lives including by not harming the amenity of existing or prospective users and residents, and state those that are likely to cause pollution (including noise) will only be permitted if measures can be implemented to minimise this to a level that provides a high standard of amenity.

Other Matters

14. The development supports an established business, which constitutes an economic benefit, though the extent of this is not clearly articulated in the evidence. Given the modest scale and context of the development this would not be sufficient to outweigh the identified harm and development plan conflict.
15. While several representations were received expressing support for the application and appeal, this does not in itself demonstrate that the development is acceptable with regard to the main issue.

Conclusion

16. The development conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole. I have found no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR