



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02.11.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/23/3327472

11 Hawthorn Grove, Heaton Moor, Stockport SK4 4HZ

- 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 Laura Shelton against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/087200, dated 22 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2023
 - The development proposed is creation of new driveway for one car.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the Council's Decision Notice as it is far more concise than that on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would preserve the character or appearance of the Heaton Moor Conservation Area (the HMCA)

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached period property, on a narrow residential street of similar styles of properties, where parking is at a premium and residential parking permits are in use. There are a considerable number of established trees within the street scene. This context gives a general sense of cohesiveness, and the result is a high-quality streetscape within the HMCA. The area is also subject to an Article 4 direction which restricts Permitted Development rights.
5. The HMCA Appraisal states that the area is made up of the development of an affluent railway suburb of the late 19th and early 20th Century which can be traced from the land assembly and arrangement of building plots.
6. Hawthorn Grove is a road of character with a strong style of traditional period properties, with front gardens generally bounded by original low stone walling. The HMCA Appraisal states that private gardens contribute to the green quality of the area.
7. The proposal would see the front garden redesigned to accommodate off street parking for a single parking space. A stretch of the existing boundary wall

- would be removed along with a tree that has separate consent to be removed. The edge of a residents parking bay would be moved to accommodate the widened access.
8. Generally, the properties in the street have unbroken sections of the original walling, with some exceptions, generally for pedestrian access. It appears from the design of the proposal that the appellant has sought to integrate the proposed parking area within a pleasant front garden space.
 9. However, the proposal would still allow for the parking of a motor vehicle adjacent to the house on the appeal property, where this arrangement would encroach on the front garden area and would result in the loss of the leafy garden character.
 10. This would be apparent in views of the appeal property from within this part of the HMCA. As such, this would fail to reflect the characteristics of the appeal property and the HMCA that I have identified. The removal of the section of boundary wall would cause harm to the significance of character and appearance of the HMCA as a whole. As such the HMCA would not be preserved or enhanced.
 11. Therefore the proposal would conflict with s72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended)
 12. Having regard to paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I consider that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the HMCA. I attach great weight to its conservation as advised by Framework paragraph 199 regardless of the less than substantial harm identified. Even so, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal as directed by paragraph 202 of the Framework.
 13. The benefit of the access improves the standard of accommodation for the appellant and any future residents. Whilst the proposal would lead to the removal of one vehicle from the road and potentially one additional parking space in an area subject to permits, this would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the HMCA.
 14. As a result, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the HMCA and I find that the development would be contrary to policy SIE-3 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD (2011) which, amongst other matters, expects development to preserve or enhance the special architectural, artistic, historic or archaeological significance or heritage assets.

Conclusion

15. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
16. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR