
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/19/3238078

Costcutter Supermarket, 24-26 Railway Street, Altrincham, WA14 2RE

- 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 Ms Jan Clark (Notemachine UK Ltd) against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 97776/FUL/19, dated 20 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the retrospective application for the installation of an ATM installed through a secure panel to the far left hand side of the shop front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. At the time of my visit, the automated teller machine (ATM) had already been installed within a fibre glass panel. I note that the proposal was amended during the application process to show the fibre glass surround replaced by glazed panels. The Council determined the proposal on that basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the host property and, linked to that, whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Stamford New Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The site lies within the Stamford New Road Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 sets out that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
6. The significance of the CA, as set out in the Stamford New Road Conservation Area Appraisal, lies in the quality of the two and three storey 19th and 20th

century buildings which contribute to the visual interest and rhythm of the street scene. The consistent use of traditional building materials and local details repeated throughout the CA provide visual harmony. The majority of properties are in some form of commercial use, particularly at ground floor level, and there are a mix of modern and traditional shop fronts.

7. The appeal property has a modern glazed double shopfront set in an aluminium frame. The ATM is positioned to one side of the frontage. It is a solid structure that contrasts starkly with the open character and appearance of the glazing. In addition, as a result of its size and bulk the ATM creates visual clutter to the shopfront and thereby adversely affects its simple character and appearance. The removal of the existing fibre glass panel would reduce the impact of the installation as a whole. However, there are no details of the proposed replacement glazed panels before me, including whether those panels would be of clear or opaque glass. It seems to me from all I have seen and read, that the ATM would have a significant depth which could be apparent through clear glass and there is insufficient information before me to assess the impact of opaque glass on the appearance of the shopfront. Accordingly, on the evidence before me, I am unconvinced that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the building or the wider Conservation Area.
8. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development enhances the street scene by appropriately addressing elevational treatment and takes account of historic distinctiveness.
9. Given that the proposal relates to only one part of the Conservation Area, the harm arising from the proposal, in terms of the approach in the National Planning Policy Framework, would be less than substantial. In these circumstances the Framework advises at paragraph 195 that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The ATM provides a service to the public and as such is of public benefit. However, I note that there are other ATM machines available locally and there is no evidence before me that the proposal performs a different function. Accordingly, this limits the weight I can give the matter as a public benefit. On that basis the benefit of the proposal is insufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the character or appearance of the CA, harm which in accordance with the requirements of the Act and the Framework, carries significant weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR