



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3342930

19 Weldon Road, Altrincham WA14 4EJ

- 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 Jude Hughes against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application 105641/HHA/21, dated 28 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for replacement front door and gate at rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front door. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the gate at the rear of the property and planning permission is granted for gate at rear of property at 19 Weldon Avenue, Altrincham WA14 4EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 105641/HHA/21, dated 28 April 2021, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it is a more succinct description than the one provided in the planning application form.
3. The Council have raised no issue with the 2m high wooden gate at the rear of the appeal property, which matches the height of the existing adjacent fencing within the terrace. I have no reason to form a different view and as the two parts of the appeal (the front door and rear gate) are clearly physically and functionally severable, I have issued a split decision in this case.
4. The Places for Everyone Plan Joint Development Plan (PfE) was adopted in March 2024. PfE policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 replaces policies L7.1 (design quality) and R1.2 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) (CS), relevant to the appeal, and referred to the Council's decision notice. As PfE policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 are also referred to in the Council's decision notice, it has not been necessary to seek further views from the parties on this matter.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the front door on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and Linotype Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. No.19 Weldon Road (No.19) is a two-storey dwelling forming the end of a terrace of 10no. dwellings (Nos.1-19, odd) on the north-west side of Weldon Road.
7. No.19 is located within the Linotype Housing Estate Conservation Area (the CA) which includes the principally residential streets of Lawrence Road, Lock Road, Pollen Road, Place Road and Weldon Road (in part). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
8. The Linotype Estate Conservation Area Management Plan (2016) (the CAMP) defines the interest of the estate as being derived predominantly from the large-scale survival of the original estate plan form, and its association with the late 19th-century movement for providing homes and amenities for workers, but also for its distinctive variety of architectural styles. The CAMP identifies seven different architectural styles within the CA; Nos.1-19 Weldon Road are 'Style Four'. The dwellings within the terrace are paired, two-storeys, with the front-door set to one side of the elevation and a large four bay ground floor window adjacent. I observed on my site visit that the terrace forms an attractive, distinctive group which is generally uniform in its composition and architectural detailing, and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
9. The original front doors have three by four panes of coloured glass to the top half of the timber door with diagonal boarding to the lower half. The front door of No.19 has been replaced with a light blue composite front door which incorporates two vertical glazing panes within the top half and two solid, moulded vertical panels in the bottom half.
10. The CAMP identifies that five of the original front doors within the terrace survive intact, two have been adapted from the original and three replaced, including No.19. The photographs at page 29 of the CAMP, and provided in the appellant's evidence, show that the pre-existing front door was timber, with small panes to the upper half with an arched design.
11. Whilst I have some sympathy with the appellant that the front door which was replaced was not original, Policy 15 of the CAMP clearly advises that where doors have been replaced any further replacements must be in timber and must conform to the original design of that house style unless it can be demonstrated that a uPVC example of a matching design can be found. The front door that has been installed clearly conflicts with this guidance, in terms of both its design, composition and materiality. I observed on my site visit that the composite door installed at No.19, with two vertical glazing panes, starkly contrasts with the front doors of the wider terrace, all of which are timber with glazing (mostly multiple panes) on the top half. It detracts from the appearance of the terrace eroding the important architectural detailing.
12. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the front door fails to preserve the character or appearance of the host property, or the CA. Consequently, it conflicts with PfE Policy JP-P1, JP-P2 and CS Policy R1.3 because it fails to demonstrate how the proposed development would preserve or enhance the CA, including in the light of area specific guidance notes. It would further

conflict with the guidance in both the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012) that great weight should be afforded to safeguarding the character and appearance of the historic environment and heritage assets.

Other Matters

13. I have had regard to the appellant's comments that the installed front door is secure and insulated, but I do not agree that the composite door looks the same as a timber alternative; the materiality, mouldings and glazing is, as described above, starkly different to other front doors in the terrace. I also acknowledge that there are other examples of replacement doors in the wider CA, but I do not have sufficient information before me to ascertain whether they pre, or post-date, the CAMP guidance. Nor, in themselves, do they justify an inappropriate front door elsewhere. I therefore have no other matters before me which lead me to form a different conclusion on the main issue to the one above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in so far as it relates to the front door, and allowed in so far as it relates to the rear gate.

R Jones

INSPECTOR