



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2025

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3373984

64 Church Street, Bradford BD8 8RE

- 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 Mohamed Niaz against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application reference is 25/01328/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing timber-framed shelter and the construction of new valeting bays.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the St Paul's Conservation Area ("the SPCA"), including the setting of the Grade II Listed St Paul's Church.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an open piece of land at the corner of Church Street and St Mary's Road, which is used for washing and valeting cars. The proposed development is the erection of a rendered blockwork structure to shelter the valeting bays, which would replace an existing timber-framed shelter in the same location.
4. The appeal site is within the SPCA, and within the setting of the Grade II Listed St Paul's Church. I therefore have statutory duties to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the church. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") states that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 202). It goes on to advise that any harm or loss requires clear and convincing justification (paragraph 213) and that any harm that is less than substantial must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal (paragraph 215).
5. The SPCA covers much of the Manningham area, a former village which was absorbed into the growing city of Bradford during the 19th and early 20th centuries. The conservation area is predominantly residential, with a variety of housing types ranging from relatively dense terraces (which make up most of the housing close to the appeal site) to large ornamented Victorian villas (mostly in the area east of Manningham Lane). There are also several community buildings, including St Paul's Church a short way west of the appeal site.

6. Stone is by some considerable way the dominant building material within the area; this use of traditional local material, as well as the retention of original features and details on many buildings, gives a strong sense of coherence which is a positive feature of the SPCA. The Council's 2007 SPCA Appraisal identifies the painting or rendering of stonework which has taken place in some parts of the conservation area as a weakness, which has generally detracted from the quality of the streetscene.
7. St Paul's Church¹ is a large church dating from 1847-48. Its tall spire and crossing tower make it a prominent local landmark. Approaching from the east, along the gentle rise up Church Street, the appeal site sits in front of the Church; it therefore forms a significant part of the setting of this Listed building.
8. The appeal site is identified in the SPCA Appraisal as making a negative contribution to the character of the conservation area. I saw on my visit that the existing shelter on the appeal site, which would be replaced, is unsympathetic in materials and ramshackle in appearance. Its removal would not in itself, therefore, be detrimental either to the character or appearance of the SPCA or to the setting of St Paul's Church. However, it does not follow that any replacement would be acceptable.
9. The proposed flat roofed form of the shelter would be incongruous in an area where the vast majority of buildings, whatever their function, have pitched roofs. The use of a render finish would also be at odds in an area dominated by stone buildings. The harm caused by the form and finish of the building would be emphasised by its prominent siting at the corner of Church Street and St Mary's Road. I note that some buildings on the opposite side of Church Street are partly rendered; they are outside the SPCA and, with the exception of a small electricity substation (which is not in itself a positive feature of the area) the render is not on the principal street elevations. Here, the render would be on the elevations facing two streets at a prominent corner.
10. The appellant's statement highlighted the challenges – financial and otherwise – of operating a business on the site. Reference is made to other car wash businesses which have timber shelters similar to that currently on the appeal site, but that this may be the case elsewhere does not justify harm to a conservation area or the setting of a Listed building. The appellant also raised the question of whether a smaller shelter further away from the road would be acceptable, and I note that the Council's officer report set out its Conservation Officer's thoughts on what might make a more appropriate design for the site. However, that is a matter for discussion between the main parties rather than something on which I can speculate here. As I have set out above, the Framework requires that harm to heritage assets requires clear and convincing justification; the arguments which have been put to me here do not amount to that.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the SPCA, and the setting of the Grade II Listed St Paul's Church would not be preserved. In the Framework's terms, the harm to the significance of the SPCA and the church as a designated heritage assets would be less than substantial. No public benefits arising from the scheme to weigh against this harm were put to me; although the planning application states that there are two full-time

¹ List Entry Number 1133216; the church is listed as the "Church of St Paul and St Jude".

and two part-time jobs on the site, which would provide a modest economic benefit, there is nothing before me to indicate that the continuation of this employment would be dependent on this particular scheme going ahead. In giving considerable importance and weight to the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, I find that this would not be outweighed by any public benefits which might arise from the development.

12. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies EN3, DS1 and DS3 of the 2017 Bradford Core Strategy. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to ensure that development contributes to achieving good design and high-quality places, creates a strong sense of place and is appropriate to its context in terms of layout, details and materials, and that heritage assets including conservation areas and listed buildings (including their settings) are protected and enhanced. For the same reasons I find conflict with the provisions of the Framework in respect of good design and protecting the historic environment.

Other Matters

13. I understand that the Council is taking, or has taken, enforcement action in respect of the existing shelter on the site. That is not something which has had any bearing on my consideration of the matters before me, which has been based on an assessment of the planning merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector