
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3368612

17 Wentworth Avenue, Urmston, Manchester M41 9DW

- 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 Neil Charles Cocker against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 115648/HHA/25.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for the construction of 1.88m fence and electrically controlled gate to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the Council's decision notice. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - Highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located in a cul-de-sac which is of an understated suburban character, and which consists of semi-detached dwellings set behind front gardens facing onto the highway. Although there is some variation in the design and materials used in the boundary treatments of the front gardens, the walls and fences are set at a relatively low level which gives the streetscape a pleasant open appearance.
5. The appeal proposal consists of a solid fence and gate located to the front of the appeal site adjacent to the highway. Due to its height and location, the proposal appears as an overdominant and incongruous feature which jars with the front boundary treatments of nearby properties and the pleasant open character of the streetscape. Decorative open features along the top edge of the fence and gate do little to mitigate for the obtrusive height and design of the proposal.

6. The Council concerns on the overly defensive character of the fencing and gate and the impression that this can give in respect of the level of crime in the area are also well-founded. The spikes on top of the proposal, although relatively decorative, add to its over-imposing appearance.
7. Therefore, due to their obtrusive height, design and location, the proposed fence and gate would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the character and design requirements of Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2024. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to achieve well-designed places. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of SPD4¹ in respect of the effect of boundary treatment on the visual character of the surrounding area.

Highway Safety

8. There are driveways to the front of the appeal site as well as the neighbouring property of 19 Wentworth Avenue which are both served by a dropped kerb crossing. Due to the height and solidity of the proposal, it obstructs the visibility splays of the vehicular access to both of these properties. Vehicles emerging from the properties as well as pedestrians and other vehicles on the highway may therefore not be aware of each other's presence, with a significant possibility that this would lead to collisions between highway users.
9. Even given the limited number of vehicle and pedestrian movements along this cul-de-sac, the effect on the visibility of vehicles emerging from the appeal site and No 19 would lead to significant harm to highway safety.
10. Due to its effect on the visibility splays of vehicles emerging from the application site and No 19, as well as the visibility of other highway users, I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to highway safety. The proposal would therefore conflict with the highway safety requirements of Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan - Core Strategy 2012. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework due to its unacceptable impact on highway safety. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of SPD3² and SPD4 in respect of crossovers and highway safety.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to the evidence provided by the appellant in respect of damage to their property, and the effect that this has had on their health and wellbeing. They refer to advice regarding community crime prevention and from the police. Reference has also been made to issues that relate to equalities, and an impact on persons with protected characteristics. In considering this appeal I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in the Equality Act 2010 which sets out relevant protected characteristics. However, the appellant's personal circumstances and the PSED considerations as they have been presented to me do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified. I am also mindful of the advice of SPD4 which states that "Whilst it is important for properties to be secure, this should not be at the expense of the property or the

¹ SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012

² SPD3: Parking Standards and Design 2012

prevailing character". Following careful consideration of these particular matters I am satisfied that the impact of dismissing this appeal is proportionate and justified.

Conclusion

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR