



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS

APPEAL BY:-

MCCARTHY AND STONE RETIREMENT LIFESTYLES LTD

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF A PART 3 STOREY PART 4 STOREY BUILDING COMPRISING 25NO. RETIREMENT FLATS, CLOSURE OF BOTH EXISTING VEHICULAR ACCESSES AND FORMATION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS ONTO OAKFIELD WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND CARPARKING.

ADDRESS:

35 OAKFIELD SALE M33 6NB

PLANNING INSPECTORATE APPEAL REFERENCE

APP/Q4245/W/23/3325034

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REFERENCE:

109745/FUL/22

SUMMARY OF PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF ELISABETH LEWIS

BA (HONS) DIP TP (CONSERVATION) MRTPI

ON BEHALF OF TRAFFORD COUNCIL

OCTOBER 2023

1.0 Qualifications and Experience

1.1 I am currently employed at Trafford Borough Council as the Heritage & Urban Design Manager within the Planning Service. I have over 20 years' experience working in the heritage sector, 17 years of those in the role of a Local Authority Conservation Officer within Greater Manchester. I have been employed at Trafford Council for 12 years as a Heritage Development Officer and I have occupied my current post since July 2022.

2.0 Scope of Evidence

In my evidence I shall set out the Council's case in relation to built heritage referring to Refusal Reason 1. This evidence is presented on behalf of Trafford Council and will examine the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and its setting and the impact of the proposed development on that significance. It should be read in conjunction with the proof prepared on behalf of the Council by Mr Cormac McGowan, who will undertake the overall planning balance judgement required by para 203; NPPF as set out in Refusal Reason 1.

3.0 Relevant Legislation, Local and National Planning Policies & guidance

3.1 An overview of the most relevant policies and guidance relevant to the Inquiry, is provided in Appendix B and includes The Trafford Core Strategy 2012; Places for Everyone; NPPF & PPG; Trafford Historic Landscape Characterisation Report; Trafford Draft Local Heritage List & Relevant Case Law & Appeal Decisions. It is this policy context which underpin the views expressed in this proof of evidence.

4.0 Main Issues

4.1 I will consider the following;

- i) Whether 35 Oakfield & its setting has sufficient significance to merit consideration in determining the application.
- ii) Whether the proposed development will cause unacceptable harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- iii) Whether the Appellant has sought to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

5.0 Analysis of Main Issues

5.1 Given the intervening distance, I consider the appeal site does not contribute to the setting or significance of any designated heritage assets.

5.2 In accordance with Annex 2; NPPF, 35 Oakfield is “considered to be a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes... assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)”.

5.3 In January 2021, Trafford Council was selected as a pilot area as part of the Greater Manchester Local Heritage List by MHCLG and is the lead local authority on this project. 35 Oakfield has been nominated by GMAAS for inclusion on Trafford's draft Local Heritage List and was added to the draft Local List on 6th May 2023 [asset 13960] following agreement at the validation panel on 18th April 2023 .

It is my firmly held view, as the Council's Heritage Expert and as demonstrated in this evidence that 35 Oakfield has sufficient significance to be identified as a non-designated

heritage asset. My evidence concludes that 35 Oakfield and its setting has medium [moderate] significance overall for its architectural, archaeological and historic [illustrative and associative] interest and makes a positive contribution to its surroundings. The building and wider site therefore hold sufficient significance to merit consideration in determining this planning application.

6.0 Summary and Conclusions

I conclude that the complete demolition of 35 Oakfield and the redevelopment of the site will cause harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, its setting and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and therefore fail to protect, preserve and enhance the borough's heritage. Contrary to para 195 NPPF, the Appellant has not sought to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

The proposed development will therefore result in major harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and this should be taken into account when determining this planning application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset [203 NPPF]. This balancing exercise will be undertaken in the evidence of Mr C McGowan.