



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **C Evans MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3374754

95 Oak Lane, Bradford BD9 4QU

- 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 David Kaushal against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02180/FUL.
 - The development proposed is shopfront replacement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I observed that a new shopfront had been installed. The Council's evidence states that this was unlawful and enforcement action is underway. This shopfront differs from the proposal before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted.
3. The appeal site is within the North Park Road Conservation Area (CA). I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area, including North Park Road CA.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located in a commercial area, in a parade of shops. It is the central property of a row of terraces. The ground floors feature various shopfronts and signs. Properties in the surrounding area are predominantly traditional stone buildings with slate roofs. It lies in the North Park Road CA, which is dominated by the ornate Italianate mass of Manningham Mills and its campanile chimney and features a mixture of buildings and land uses.
6. The North Park Road CA Appraisal (November 2007) identifies that part of the significance of the area derives from its busy main streets, the mixture of buildings and land uses and the remaining traditional shopfronts, mainly along Oak Lane. Traditional features and details of buildings are identified as a strength of the CA, which contribute positively towards its character and appearance. The appeal site

adds to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

7. Prior to the breach of planning control taking place, the appeal property featured a traditional timber shopfront with decorative glazing and recessed doorway to the right-hand side. The Council contends that the parade previously featured other traditional shopfronts with stallrisers, timber frames and multi-paned glazing to the transoms, with fascia panels above. Consequently, the previous shopfront also contributed positively towards the significance of the CA.
8. The proposed shopfront would be timber with double glazed windows over an MDF stallriser and would have a centrally placed double-glazed door with no recess. No decorative glazing or transom is proposed. Whilst the proposal includes some traditional features, it would lack the high quality and detailing of the previous shopfront, and as required by the Shop Front Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2007). Moreover, whilst I recognise that the proposed shopfront would be an improvement on the existing modern replacement, that shopfront is understood to be unauthorised. As a result, I find that the proposed shopfront would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
9. The appellant has put to me that the proposal would relate well to the upper floors of the building and would give positive improvements to the high street. Whilst, as set out above, some of these are features of good design, they do not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. Other properties in the parade have been altered and include non-traditional shopfronts. I have limited information regarding these and the circumstances under which they have come into place, including their planning history. However, the Council has stated that enforcement action is underway on properties in the area. In any case, their presence does not justify the proposal before me and each appeal must be determined on its own individual circumstances.
11. The proposed shopfront would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, as required by Section 72(1) of the Act. The harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial to a limited degree within that spectrum due to the modest scale and nature of the proposal.
12. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, which includes CAs, should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development and, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The property is currently in use as a dental practice, which provides public benefits. However, no details have been put to me to demonstrate that this proposal is necessary for the practice to continue operating. Consequently, this public benefit would not outweigh the considerable importance and weight attached to the harm that I have found.
13. In conclusion, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and the character and appearance of the host building and area. It would conflict with policies EN3, DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), which require proposals to preserve, protect and enhance the character and appearance of designated heritage assets, achieve good design and for shopfronts to be consistent with the local character, scale, quality and materials.

Conclusion

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

C Evans

INSPECTOR