
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3363315

10 Rosefinch Road, West Timperley, Altrincham WA14 5YB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Philip Webster against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 115110/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is described as the creation of new vehicular access and off-road parking with new dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issues

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The main issues in regard to which are the effects of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is located in an attractive verdant residential area, dominated by unified front garden hedgerow boundaries enclosing lawned areas with other generous landscaping throughout. Parking courtyards and bays are predominantly to the rear or side of dwellings, including the appeal property which benefits from a single detached garage and additional parking space to the rear. These elements lead to a strong uniformed, open, green, cohesive quality to the street scene that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposed vehicle access would result in the removal of the front boundary hedge and loss of the front lawn. Although the appellant has stated that they would provide additional planting, in this instance the displaced location thereof, removal of the soft lawn and the significant visual intrusion of a parked vehicle in the front garden would unacceptably erode the verdant charm of the street scene.
5. None of the examples cited are sufficiently comparable to the scheme before me, with the exception of Number 106 Riverbank Road which, due to the loss of its front boundary hedge, results in an incongruous appearance, further emphasising the harm this type of development has on the street scene and wider area. I am in any case unaware of the planning status of any works that have been carried out.

6. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2022 to 2039 (2024), and guidance contained in the SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which amongst other things, seek to ensure development respects the character and identity of the locality and complements the street scene.

Highway Safety

7. The limited size of the proposed car park space would struggle to accommodate any sizeable vehicle that would not hamper or overhang the pedestrian footway. Several manoeuvres would be necessary for a vehicle to access and egress the site, increasing the likelihood of conflict between them and another vehicle or a pedestrian, with the added impedance to the free flow of traffic when a vehicle would need to stop in the carriageway to commence the parking manoeuvres. This would be further exacerbated by the active nature of the highway.
8. Consequently, there would be harm to highway safety contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), and guidance contained in SPD3: Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Planning Document (2012). These require, amongst other things, new development to have regard for highway safety. The National Planning Policy Framework states planning permission should be refused if there is an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

9. I recognise the sustainability value of the installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) chargers. However, I am not convinced that an EV charging point could not successfully be installed in or on the existing garage. It's weight therefore as a benefit of the scheme would be very limited. The issues of building regulations and the Council's conduct during the application process falls outside the scope of my assessment which must focus on the planning merits of the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR