



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/W/21/3274923

600 Liverpool Road, Irlam, M44 5AA

- 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 Scott Camm (Scott Camm Building) against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/76194/FUL, dated 9 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of the Railway Inn and erection of 6 no.1 bedroom and 6 no. 2 bedroom apartments parking provision, cycle storage and re-cycling bin enclosure, together with site landscaping .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Scott Camm (Scott Camm Building) against Salford City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:-
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the locality.
 - The effect of the development on the living conditions of future residents.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a former Public House, which I understand from the evidence submitted has been closed since 2016. It is located in a mixed-use area, with both commercial and residential property in the locality. The appeal proposal seeks to demolish the existing Public House and erect 12 apartments in a three-storey block.
5. The building would be set back from the front boundary of the site, as well as the main highway, by the retention of a service road to the front of the site, which is owned by the appellant but does not form part of the appeal site. The proposal would be flat roofed in nature, with elevations mainly constructed in brickwork, but with sections in render, and ash planking. There would be balconies to front and rear elevations. It would be of a similar height to

- adjacent properties. 10no parking spaces, a cycle store and bin store would be provided as part of the proposals.
6. The Council has asked the appellant to look into stopping up the service road to the front of the building and either integrate it into the appeal site or use it to widen the existing footway. The appellant has been unwilling to stop up the service road due to the expense of legally completing the procedure.
 7. As stated previously, the proposed building would be no taller than surrounding properties, but the structure would be three storeys with a flat roof, which would look incongruous and out of place within the street scene, which is made up of two storey development with roof structures, in a more traditional arrangement. I find the use of three storeys in that height profile creates a building that would look to have the wrong proportions when seen in that street scene, accentuated by the number of glazed openings and the size of those respective apertures.
 8. I consider that the three-storey element, due to its height and scale would appear as an obtrusive feature extending across the site and would contrast uncomfortably with the predominant two-storey design of properties in the locality and appear as a contrived and incongruous feature which would draw the eye to the bulk and massing of the three-storey element.
 9. For the above reasons I conclude that due to its scale, massing, location and design the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policies H1, DES1 and DES2 of the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan (2006) (the UDP) which together, amongst other matters, expect development to give regard to the character, scale and pattern of streets and building plots, the relationships to other buildings, the street's vertical and horizontal rhythms. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regards to achieving well designed places.

Living Conditions

10. As stated previously, there are balconies proposed to the front and rear elevation of the building. This is the only private, usable amenity space to the dwellings. These balconies are the subject of some dispute in terms of the actual measurements but are approximately 2.5 square metres in size.
11. No other space has been allocated, and as such I find that the private amenity space for each future resident is inadequate with no external space allocated as part of the proposals.
12. Consequently, the paucity of useable amenity space would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed dwellings. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies H1 and DES7 of the UDP, which, amongst other matters, expect development to provide an adequate level of amenity.

Other Matters

13. I have noted the contributions requested by the Council and the acceptance of those by the appellant. Whilst this is a factor in favour of the development, I find that it does not outweigh the harms that I have identified from the development were it to go ahead.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of sufficient material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR