



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2026

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/25/3359538

28-32 Greenwood Street, Altrincham, Trafford WA14 1RZ

- 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 Kennedy Hospitality Limited against the decision of Trafford Council.
- The application Ref is 114438/FUL/24.
- The development proposed is described as retrospective application proposing retention of covered storage area and shipping container used for storage, bin store and extension of fence line (maximum 2.7m) at rear boundary.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site lies within the Old Market Place Conservation Area (OMPCA) and in accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
3. At the time of my visit I observed a covered storage area, shipping container, bin store, as well as some fencing, were all in situ at the rear of the appeal site. However, the developments I observed did not match that shown on the submitted proposed plans. I have therefore based my decision on the details shown on the submitted proposed plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the OMPCA and the George Street Conservation Area (GSCA).

Reasons

5. The OMPCA incorporates a relatively large area, centred on the Old Market Place in Altrincham. It covers much of the historic commercial core of the town, with a surviving medieval layout, and I observed varied architectural styles of generally two and three storey buildings, predominantly dating from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, constructed using traditional materials. The OMPCA also consists of a mixture of civic, commercial and residential uses, and has a history of markets and public gatherings.
6. I found these factors collectively remind of its long history and development as a market town and therefore contribute to the significance of the OMPCA as a whole.

7. The Old Market Place Conservation Area Appraisal – Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.3 (2014) (the OMPCAA) sets out that the appeal site lies within Character Zone D: *The Market Civic, Commercial and Residential Area*. The appeal property is located within an attractive terrace row of two-storey properties which are identified in the OMPCAA as positive contributors to the character and appearance of the CA. The Council therefore state that the buildings in this row, including the appeal property, are non-designated heritage assets (NDHA). In this regard, I found that the features of architectural interest within this terrace row lies within their attractive front elevations facing onto Greenwood Street.
8. The appeal site also lies just outside, but adjacent to, the GSCA. The significance of the GSCA in part derives from its historic value as an urban settlement from the medieval period where it consisted of a mixture of residential properties and workshops. Its present use as a strong retail and commercial hub has continually evolved since the Victorian period, resulting in varying architectural style and ages of the buildings.
9. The George Street Conservation Area Appraisal – Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.1 (2014) (the GSCAA) identifies the two-storey, flat roofed, building at 88-98 George Street, situated directly to the rear of appeal site and on the opposite side of Central Way, as a positive contributing building which the Council consider to be a NDHA. However, I found the rear elevation of the NDHA at 88-98 George Street, facing towards the appeal site, includes limited features of architectural detailing.
10. The appeal relates specifically to the rear yard area of Kennedy's Irish Bar which fronts onto Greenwood Street. This rear yard faces onto Central Way and along with the other rear yards in this terrace row is highlighted in the OMPCAA as an area for potential enhancement.
11. The highway of Central Way connects Shaw Road and Regent Road, and provides access to the market, and other commercial uses, including a cinema, restaurants and outdoor seating areas.
12. Whilst the nearby market was not operational at the time of my site visit, I still observed that Central Way was well used. The animation of activities associated with people using Central Way gives this street a bustling and vibrant character, making a positive contribution to the OMPCA and adjacent GSCA. I find the rear yard area of the appeal site, being visible from the market and the outdoor seating areas, therefore represents a visually prominent location within this part of the OMPCA.
13. The appeal scheme seeks consent for a covered storage area, a shipping container, a bin store and fencing, all located within the rear yard of the appeal property.
14. The development would infill a significant portion of the rear yard area and would extend to the back of the pavement serving the highway of Central Way. Through a combination of their appearance and materials, the areas of close boarded timber fencing, as well as the mono-pitched roof on the covered storage area, would not represent traditional and typical features of the historic centre of Altrincham.
15. Additionally, the height, siting and design of the fencing would detract from, and be at odds with, the rear of the predominantly brick-finished buildings in this terrace row and represent visually incongruous and dominant features within the street scene, particularly the proposed sections of fencing that would measure 2.7m high to screen

the container. As such, whilst I do not find that the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the architectural features of interest within the nearby NDHAs, it would cause visual harm to this part of the OMPCA, as well as harm to the significance of the nearby GSCA.

16. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 of the Framework states that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset from development should require clear and convincing justification.
17. In coming to the above view, I have therefore had regard to existing timber fencing at the adjoining site, and elsewhere along Central Way. Nonetheless, the Council state that the fencing at the adjoining property does not have permission and in any case, I observed that is not as high, and therefore would not be as visually prominent, as some sections of the fencing proposed by this appeal scheme.
18. With regard to other fencing on Central Way, and in particular the timber fencing used to screen the containers at Market Place, I have not been provided with all the planning history details of these areas of fencing. However, I note the Council state that these were only granted temporary planning permission, which has now expired, and that they were granted under a different planning policy context.
19. Be that as it may, during my visit I found that these areas of existing fencing do form part of the appearance of the wider street scene and surrounding area. Nevertheless, given their clear association with the market, which includes a large timber framed canopy, and their set back from the carriageway, I did not find them to be as visually conspicuous or dominant as the proposed fencing at the appeal site would be, due to its proposed siting at the back of the pavement.
20. As such, I do not find these existing sections of timber fencing along Central Way to be directly comparable to the proposed fencing before me, and this therefore limits the weight I attribute to them in favour of the proposal.
21. Furthermore, Policy 30 of the George Street Conservation Area Management Plan SPD 5.1a (2016) (GSCAMP) states that the ad hoc boundary treatments on Central Way should be addressed. It goes on to state that boundary treatments should be of a good quality using traditional materials such as brick; that no boundary treatment may also be appropriate; and that proposed boundary treatments should take into consideration the wider context.
22. The Old Market Plan Conservation Area Management Plan SPD 5.3a (2016) (OMPCAMP) also seeks to avoid low quality boundary treatments that have an undesirable effect on the character of the CA, and the Trafford Design Code (2024) requires that boundary treatments must be in keeping with the surrounding traditional context. For the reasons given, I find the proposed development would not adhere to the advice within these guidance documents.
23. My attention has also been drawn to the previous condition of the rear yard area at the appeal site, which was evidently more visually open in appearance and used for car parking. I accept its former appearance was not a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the area, hence its designation in the OMPCAA as an area for potential enhancement. I do not however consider this to be justification for

the appeal proposal which I find would cause visual harm to the area for the reasons given.

24. The appellant has suggested that the nature of the proposed developments mean that the works are reversible and consequently a planning condition could be attached requiring their removal once the appellant vacates the premise. I have no information before me in respect of the time period for which the appellant may occupy this premise, and in any case, subsequent occupiers could seek to retain the proposed development with a similar condition and justification. Consequently, the harm arising from the appeal proposal could potentially be long lasting. The suggested condition would therefore not reduce the visual harm that I have identified arising from the proposal to an acceptable level.
25. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the immediate surrounding area. It would also cause less than substantial harm to the significance of both the OMPCA and GSCA, with the level of harm being at the lower end of that spectrum. Nevertheless, mindful of my statutory duty, I give this harm considerable importance and weight.
26. Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
27. The appellant details how this bar is a popular and thriving community business within the town centre, which offers a range of facilities not provided at other similar establishments, including live music. Their submission acknowledges that whilst not ideal, the container is an essential piece of infrastructure for the business, as it operates as a 'cellar' and storage area.
28. The appellant states that without a 'cellar' (the container) the business would close, which would be a loss to the customers and community it serves, including the sports teams and events it sponsors. Any potential closure of the bar would also result in the loss of jobs, as well as impacting upon local supply chains and the support the business provides to local enterprises. It is also claimed that the bin storage area is an essential item of infrastructure which provides a visual screen of the bins and allows them to be collected from Central Way.
29. I agree that a 'cellar' and storage areas represent essential infrastructure for a bar of this size. The Council have however suggested that the 'cellar' and bin storage areas could be provided internally within the existing building, therefore removing any harmful visual impact at the rear of the property.
30. I observed on site that storage space within the property is limited and therefore locating the 'cellar' and storage areas internally would result in the loss of considerable space currently used by patrons, which in turn would likely impact upon the operation of the existing business. However, I have limited substantive evidence before me as to the exact amount of space that would be lost and its implications for the overall viability of the business.
31. Nevertheless, even in a scenario whereby the use of existing internal areas for these storage areas was found to make the business unviable, it has also been suggested that a more sensitive and in keeping extension could be erected at the rear of the property to provide this essential infrastructure.

32. The appellant contends that building an extension would be expensive and because they only lease the site there would be no security on such an investment. It is also claimed that they would need to obtain permission from the landlord for such an extension and there is no guarantee it would be approved by the Council.
33. I have however been provided with no evidence or comparisons in respect of the costs associated with providing an alternatively designed extension at the rear of the property, or the specific financial impacts of this for the business. Furthermore, there is no evidence before me that the appellant has engaged with either the landlord or the Council to discuss potential alternatively designed extensions at the rear of the property.
34. Consequently, from the information before me, I am not convinced that the appeal scheme is the only way for the appellant to provide these essential infrastructure requirements for the premise. This therefore limits the weight I can attribute to the appellant's claim that the business would close without the specific 'cellar' and storage areas proposed by this appeal as public benefits in favour of the proposal.
35. As such, when taken together, I find that the above-mentioned public benefits do not outweigh the considerable importance and weight I must attach to the special attention that I must pay to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the OMPCA, and the harm to the significance of the adjacent GSCA.
36. In view of all the above, I conclude the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the OMPCA, and it would also harm the significance of the GSCA.
37. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024), Policy R1 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) (CS). These policies together require, among other things, that development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used; must take account of historic distinctiveness; preserve or enhance Conservation Areas; and that the heritage significance of a site or area is considered in accordance with national planning policy.
38. The proposal would also fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the relevant sections of the Framework, as well as the relevant guidance contained within the Trafford Design Code, OMPCAA, GSCAA, OMPCAMP and GSCAMP, which I have set out above.

Other Matters

39. The appellant has commented that previous occupiers of the appeal property have all gone bankrupt and the common denominator is the lack of basement storage. There is no substantive evidence before me in support of this claim.
40. My attention has been drawn to a previously dismissed appeal¹ for the '*siting of temporary container to be used for cellar/store of refreshments and bin store*' to the rear of the appeal site. However, the appeal scheme before me seeks consent for an amended proposal and thus I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

¹ APP/Q4245/W/24/3338601

Conclusion

41. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

R Major

INSPECTOR