



Appeal Decision

Site visits made on 5 and 15 February 2026

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3375071

Bon and Belle, 44 Bradford Road, Idle, Bradford BD10 9PE

- 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 Mrs Beth Walker of Bon and Belle Ltd against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application reference is 25/02727/FUL.
 - The development proposed is an external roller shutter to shop window in front elevation.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 30 March 2026.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to a ground floor commercial unit, occupied by a hair and beauty salon. The development for which planning permission is sought, the installation of an external roller shutter on the shopfront, has been carried out.
3. The salon was open for business at the time I carried out my initial site visit on Thursday 5 March 2026, so the roller shutters were not closed and I was not able to fully see their impact. I therefore carried out a second visit on Sunday 15 March at a time when the salon and shutters were closed, so that I could properly assess the development.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the shutters on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is close to Idle village centre. Nearby buildings are predominantly in residential or commercial use, or a mix of the two; there are also community uses, including Idle Baptist Church immediately to the south on Bradford Road. Many buildings in the village are stone-built, and probably Victorian in origin; the appeal property itself falls into this typology. Shopfronts generally retain a traditional appearance, especially within the very centre of the village, though there is a relatively modern (that is, probably from the 1960s or 70s) shopping precinct across Bradford Road to the south-east.

6. The Council's 2012 *A Shopkeepers Guide to Securing their Premises* Supplementary Planning Document ("the SPD") provides advice intended to balance security needs with achieving a high standard of design. Among other things, it notes advice from West Yorkshire Policy ("WYP") that, although solid roller shutters can provide physical security, they can lead to a "deadening" effect on shopping streets, giving them an unwelcome and neglected appearance. The SPD therefore sets out a strong presumption against the provision of solid external roller shutters and external shutter boxes to the principal elevation of shopfronts, preferring instead the use of measures such as laminated security glass and frame strengthening, and internal lattice or "brick bond" grilles. The SPD also advises that external lattice, brick bond or open chain link grilles may be acceptable, where it has been demonstrated that internal measures are not suitable.
7. The shutter which has been installed extends across the full width of the main display window and shop doorway. Although the box housing the roller when open was described in the submitted planning statement as slim and aligned with the fascia, I saw that it protrudes significantly forward of the building. The shutter and guide rails are painted black and, though this is a "neutral" colour and they appear to be well-maintained, the installation as a whole contrasts unfavourably with, and detracts from, the otherwise high-quality and essentially traditional form and appearance of the shopfront.
8. The appellant referred to other solid external shutters within and around the village centre, which I was able to view during my two visits. The vast majority of shutters I saw when walking round the area were either of the internal type preferred by the SPD, or the alternative open external types. Solid shutters are very much a minor part of, rather than a significant factor in, the existing character and appearance of the village centre. At the modern precinct opposite the appeal site, most of the solid shutters (with the exception of those at the Co-Op supermarket) were closed during my Sunday visit; they illustrated exactly the deadening effect described in the SPD, and do not carry significant weight in favour of the appeal scheme.
9. The planning statement submitted with the planning application noted that internal measures had been explored but found not to be feasible due to limited internal space and the unit's layout. While the application was being determined, in correspondence with the Council they also referred to the stepped floor levels, the high ceiling, and the lack of a practical secure fixing point for internal grilles. However, no further details such as drawings or cost estimates which might demonstrate that internal measures are not suitable (whether because of practicality or viability) have been provided.
10. The appellant has stated that the shutter was installed as a response to the shopfront being damaged in March 2024. During the planning application consultation, WYP noted limited acquisitive crime in the area, but recorded the March 2024 incident as "criminal damage in which paint stripper was thrown on an external wall". I am sympathetic to the appellant having to deal with such an attack while operating and attempting to grow a recently-established business, and note the suggestion in the appeal statement that it had been a targeted attack, rather than (say) a random act of vandalism. I do not seek to downplay the seriousness of such an incident; however, I am not persuaded that even that provides a strong justification for a set of stark external shutters which harm the character of the area, rather than a targeted law enforcement response.

11. The appellant suggested that “any perceived harm” might be mitigated by a condition requiring repainting in a colour to match the stonework. However, while this might reduce the shutter’s visual contrast with its surroundings, it would not address the deadening effect outside trading hours. The appellant proposed that a condition might be imposed requiring the replacement of the solid shutter with a perforated one at the end of its lifespan. However, for the reasons I have set out above, I do not consider that the requirements of the SPD in respect of demonstrating the necessity of external security measures have been met.
12. I conclude that the development has caused unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the 2017 Bradford Core Strategy which, among other things, seek to ensure that development achieves good design which puts quality of place first, which are informed by a good understanding of the site and its context, including in respect of details and materials, and which respond to existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character of the area.

Other Matters

13. I note from the appellant’s evidence that the Council has begun enforcement action in respect of the shutter. I do not know the outcome of those proceedings (or if they have been held over while this appeal is determined), and they have had no bearing on my assessment of the planning matters in this appeal.

Conclusion

14. While I have considered the benefits of the scheme which have been put to me, there are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector