



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2026

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003729

2, Walsingham Avenue, Manchester M20 2XG

- 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 Dr Dexter Tarr against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 143856/FH/2025.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing brick wall to front boundary and relocation of existing gate post to create a driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the movement and safety of pedestrians; and
 - whether the proposed development would enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the Albert Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

Pedestrian movement and safety

3. The appeal property is an end terrace house, in a row of properties that, apart from 1 Walsingham Avenue (No 1), do not have off road parking. Vehicles therefore park on the public highway, in a position diagonally across the pavement. Such parking takes place on both sides of the road and along the entire length of Walsingham Avenue, resulting in its pavements being largely impassable for pedestrians.
4. At 4.49 metres (m), the length of the proposed parking space falls short of the minimum standard of 6m. Many vehicles would, therefore, be longer than the available space and would overhang the pavement in a similar manner to No 1 and on Warwick Avenue, as shown in the photographs provided by the appellant. Nonetheless, such an overhang would not obstruct the pavement to any greater extent than the current situation. I therefore find that pedestrian safety would not be materially harmed because of the proposal.
5. Parking across the pavement would continue along Walsingham Avenue even if the proposed parking space was utilised, forcing pedestrians onto the carriageway, and possibly in the path of an oncoming vehicle. Vehicles would also have to reverse within the public highway to access or exit the proposed parking space as

turning on site would not be possible. As such, the conditions along Walsingham Avenue would be largely unchanged and, therefore, I do not agree that the proposal would be a highway betterment, as suggested by the appellant.

6. I therefore find that the proposal would have a neutral, not harmful, effect on the movement and safety of pedestrians. It would not conflict with policies SP1, DM1 and T1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (CS), adopted July 2012, which seek to promote walking and ensure that development has regard to road safety. In addition, it would not conflict with the similar aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conservation Area

7. As the appeal site is within the CA, I have had regard to the statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, as set out at Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
8. The CA covers an extensive area and is primarily residential. Insofar as is relevant to the appeal, the CA is characterised by Victorian-style terraced houses with modest forecourts bounded by low brick walls. Front gardens that retain planting, in combination with the street trees along many roads within the CA, create a verdant and pleasant quality. These aspects positively contribute to the significance of the CA.
9. Walsingham Avenue is one of five short streets between Barlow Moor Road and Northern Grove on the east side of Burton Road, as is Warwick Avenue referred to above. The properties within such streets are of a uniform design and are set behind front gardens, the majority of which, other than on Warwick Avenue, retain their low brick boundary wall. Therefore, whilst walls have been removed within the wider CA and parking introduced at the front of many properties, the existence of parking spaces and open, hard surfaced frontages is not the norm on streets that are comparable to Walsingham Avenue.
10. The proposal would involve the removal of the entire front boundary wall on the appeal site. This would diminish the strong form of enclosure in this location and would erode the green character of the street through the loss of existing planting. This would not preserve the character or appearance of the CA, and would not be mitigated by the repositioning, and retention, of the gate posts.
11. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). With reference to paragraph 214, in finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. In this instance, the harm would be at the lower end of 'less than substantial' but is nonetheless of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, paragraph 215 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
12. Provision of an on-site parking space would enable a vehicle to park off road. However, as I have found that such provision would not materially improve pedestrian movements and/or safety, this is a private and not a public benefit. Accordingly, there are no public benefits to outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the CA.

13. Therefore, I find the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Albert Park Conservation Area. It would therefore be contrary to saved policy DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan, CS Policy EN3, and Policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document, adopted March 2024. These policies, amongst other things, seek to preserve and enhance the historic environment. It would also be contrary to the similar aims of the Framework.

Conclusion

14. Whilst I have found that the proposal would not unacceptably harm the movement and safety of pedestrians, this does not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the CA. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harms and associated development plan conflict.
15. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR