



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2020

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/W/19/3242120

Go Outdoors, 207 Stockport Road, Cheadle Heath, Stockport SK3 0TQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Go Outdoors Ltd against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/073766, dated 13 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the installation of anti-vandal spin guards to existing paladin fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal development is located on the north side of Edgeley Road to the rear of the Go Outdoors retail store which customers access from Stockport Road. In the vicinity of the development is a row of residential properties and other commercial uses. Opposite the development is a school.
4. The anti-vandal spin guards have a metallic colour and have already been installed on top of a black paladin fence. To the rear of the fence is the exposed service yard to the Go Outdoors store which does little to enhance the overall character of the area.
5. At my site visit I saw that along Edgeley Road there were a number of different styles of railings in the vicinity of the site. The ones which fronted the road included green palisade fencing, and other coloured railings which include pointed finials such as those at the adjacent site (Tile Mountain).
6. Whilst fencing which has a degree of security measures incorporated into it is prevalent in the area, none of the fencing on the nearby sites have the harsh visual appearance of the anti-vandal spin guards which are the subject of this appeal. To my mind, the harsh visual appearance of the spin guards in such a prominent position in the streetscene provides a compelling reason why planning permission should not be granted.

7. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that the length of the spin guards is only a small percentage of the overall boundary fence line. However, it is also located on the most prominent section in the streetscene and where the most visual intrusion occurs as a result.
8. I have also considered the apparent need for additional security measures at the appeal site and the overarching context of paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, whilst these factors weigh in favour of the proposal, to my mind, they do not provide sufficient justification for a development which has an adverse impact on the streetscene and the overall character and appearance of the area.
9. Finally, I have also considered whether an alternative colour (such as black to match the paladin fencing) would overcome these concerns. Whilst an alternative suitable colour would no doubt reduce the overall visual impact, I remain unconvinced that this would completely address the harm I have identified.
10. For the above reasons the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy SIE1 of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD (2011) which amongst other matters seek to ensure that development is designed and landscaped to the highest contemporary standard. It would also be at odds with the overarching design aims of the Framework.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR