

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 June 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/21/3270564

16 Pollen Road, Altrincham, WA14 4HA

- 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 Mr Andrew Salt against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 101964/HHA/20, dated 21 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is alteration of existing fence to rear garden.
-

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 Matters

3. The fence has been repositioned and the application was made retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal in that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether or not the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Linotype Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Linotype Estate CA is characterised by rows of terraced housing surviving from the original workers estate connected to the nearby Linotype Works, with grassed ginnels which make a positive contribution to the CA.
6. The appeal property is a mid-terrace house with a grassed ginnel providing pedestrian access to the rear of the properties. The ginnels are identified in the Linotype Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) with a specific policy designed to preserve and keep them in good condition.
7. The timber materials of the fence have been relocated from the original position and the height of approximately 1.5 metres meets the guidance in the

SPD. However, the repositioned fence serves to reduce the width of the ginnel, and spaciousness of the shared grassed open areas to the rear of the dwellings. The uniform open character of the space behind the properties has been reduced and has resulted in harm to the character and appearance of the CA.

8. On the site visit I saw that there are instances where the rear fences of the properties have been relocated into the ginnel, including at the neighbouring property. I am not aware whether these have been subject to planning approval. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on the site-specific circumstances of the case.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development has harmed the character and appearance of the CA and accordingly it does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, the development does not meet the statutory tests set out in the Act and conflicts with Policies L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) and the guidance in the SPD. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development is appropriate in its context, enhances the street scene and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
10. The development affects only part of the CA and therefore in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the harm caused to its significance is less than substantial. The approach in paragraph 196 of the Framework is that where a proposal leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.
11. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's need for additional private outdoor space and security this is a private benefit. On the basis of the evidence before me there are no public benefits that outweigh the harm to the CA, which given the requirement of the Act and advice in Paragraph 193 of the Framework, carries great weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR