



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/D/24/3356673

108-110 Littleton Road, Salford M7 3TW

- 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 Mr Matthew Mahmud against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2024/1068.
 - The development proposed is retention of boundary wall with associated piers and gates to front and sides of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. I saw on my site visit that the development has already commenced and appears to have been completed. Planning permission is therefore sought on a retrospective basis and I have made my recommendation on that basis.
4. I have taken the site address from the Council's Decision Notice as it is clear in the evidence and from my observations that the development relates to two properties.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The site is located on the corner of Littleton Road and St Aidan's Grove. Littleton Road consists of mostly two storey terraced properties which are setback from the street by modest front gardens. The front boundary treatments are predominantly formed of low brick walls of narrow depth with railings which are unobtrusive in their appearance. The low brick walls are more often of a dark red colour which generally matches the colour of the brickwork at the ground floor of the dwellings that they are associated with. This creates a pleasant degree of uniformity which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The properties combined have a wide frontage, and the boundary wall spans the full length of the front boundary. Its height and thickness appear noticeably bulkier and more dominant than the generally more modest and streamlined walls on the street. This is emphasised by the tall, deep side profile of the rendered columns. The materials, including cream rendered pillars with accompanying stone spheres, are not complementary to the host dwelling or the wider street scene. The development does not therefore reflect the form, details or materials of typical front boundary treatments along Littleton Road and is an incongruous feature in the street, lacking visual permeability when viewed in the wider context of the surrounding boundary treatments.
8. It is noted that the appellant could paint the wall without the need for planning permission. However, regardless of this, the height, scale, design, and lack of cohesion with the surrounding boundary treatments causes harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. It is in dispute between the parties whether the boundary creates a hostile appearance. Having regard to the Oxford English Dictionary definition, I have taken hostile to mean 'unfriendly'. Given the overall height, scale, length and design of the boundary it appears overly defensive and unwelcoming. For these reasons, I therefore agree with the Council that it appears hostile.
10. In conclusion, the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the development is contrary to Policies D1, D2 and D6 of the Salford Local Plan: Development Management Policies and Designations (2023) which seeks, among other matters, for development to protect, enhance and respond to any positive character and distinctiveness of an area.
11. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires development to be visually attractive and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

12. The appellant contends that the development does not require planning permission due to the passage of time. However, it is not within the confines of this appeal, under S78 of the Act¹ for me to determine the lawfulness of the development or otherwise. The appeal follows a planning application specifically seeking planning permission and I have considered it on that basis. There are other mechanisms available to the appellant to establish lawfulness for the reasons they have set out.
13. The appellant also refers to a fallback position of erecting a wall within the allowances of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Specifically, Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A. As the appeal development exceeds the height of the previous boundary treatment and is over 1 metre in height adjacent to a highway, there is no directly comparable fallback using permitted development rights. I therefore give this limited weight in the appeal.
14. The appellant outlines the benefits of the development to them, such as an increase in privacy and security. I also note that letters of support have been received. However, these benefits and the matters raised in support for the

¹ Town and Country Planning Act 1990

development are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

15. I have also had regard to the appellant's submission that there are no objections to the development, including from the Council's Highways Department. However, the absence of objections does not preclude a full and proper assessment of the planning merits of the case and does not outweigh the harm I have identified in regard to the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR