



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 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: 22nd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/21/3277404

46 Grasmere Road, Gatley, Cheadle, SK8 4RS

- 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 Khalid Ahmed against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/079357, dated 12 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as front area of house to fence off as current crime situation and carjacking is occurring in area. Erecting a boundary of 2m high to prevent theft and unauthorised access to property.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and
 - the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. No 46 Grasmere Road is an extended detached dwelling located in a residential area. It is set back from the road with a parking area to the front of the property. The area has an open character, with dwellings set back from the road with limited front boundary treatments consisting mainly of hedges and landscaping. The open character of the area is accentuated by the low level landscaping between the properties.
5. Due to the design, height, length and siting of the wall and railings in a prominent location on a straight section of road, the proposal would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature in the streetscene which would

significantly detract from the area's attractive open and spacious character and appearance.

6. Whilst I acknowledge that there are some dwellings with front boundary treatments in the area, the majority of these are created from landscaping, are low level and retain the open character of the area. The limited examples of higher level boundaries are fences which contain the gardens of corner plots and spaces between dwellings, thus are not comparable to the context of the appeal site.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) and saved policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development has regard to the built environment and does not adversely affect character. It would also conflict with guidance in the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which states that development should make a positive contribution to the provision of an attractive built environment and policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Highway safety

8. The railings and gates would be positioned immediately to the rear of the pavement. Visibility splays at the entrance gate would not be provided. As a consequence, drivers of vehicles exiting the drive would be likely to have limited visibility of pedestrians using the pavement within the vicinity of the site, particularly if they were reversing out of the parking area given the gradient of the drive, relative to the highway. This could result in conflict between pedestrians, including young children and those with disabilities. As such the proposed development creates a safety risk to pedestrians using the pavement when approaching and crossing the appeal property's access.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety for pedestrians in conflict with Policies SIE-3, CS-9 and T-3 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) which together, amongst other things seek to ensure developments protect the safety of all road users. It would also conflict with guidance in the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which states that access arrangements should be safe and practical, and policies in the Framework relating to the provision of safe accesses.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the personal circumstances of the appellant and the desire to provide security for the property. However, it is likely that other measures could be taken to improve security which would not compromise the safety of pedestrians or be harmful to the character of the area. This limits the weight that I give this matter in my consideration of this case.
11. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the case. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance. In considering this appeal, I am only able to have regard to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, 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