
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2017

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4325/D/17/3168663

45 Hertford Drive, Wallasey, Merseyside CH45 7PU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Mairead Noonan against the decision of Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/16/01138, dated 15 September 2016, was refused by a notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is retrospective planning permission for raised decking to the front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application is described as 'retrospective' and it was clear from my site visit that the raised decking, as shown on the plans submitted with this appeal, has been constructed. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that the development has already occurred.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an imposing red brick dwelling with a distinctive crenelated parapet. It occupies an elevated position on the corner of the street, with clear views over the Mersey Estuary. Moreover, its frontage is particularly prominent when viewed from the neighbouring promenade.
 5. The extensive decking and projecting staircase appear as an incongruous excrescence perched above the sloping front garden area and dominating the property's frontage. The unstained timber structure, and the railway sleepers which support it, have a harsh and crude appearance which contrasts sharply with the simple and robust brick façade of the appeal property. It is an intrusive element and detracts from the visual qualities of the host property and the promenade.
 6. I recognise that the sloping nature of the front garden makes it difficult to utilise as an amenity area. However, I saw on my visit that other properties
-

within the street have much smaller patio areas, sited close to their houses and have retain landscaped terraced gardens. Unfortunately, the private wishes of the appellant to create a level amenity area do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character or appearance of the area. Nor would the addition of potted plants on the decking area mitigate the harm. I do not have any specific details of the other examples of new development within the Borough which the appellant has referred to, and I did not see any other examples of similar development close by which were as intrusive as this development. In any event I have considered the appeal on its own merits.

7. I conclude that the raised decking has a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It conflicts with the development plan, and in particular with Policy HS11 of the adopted Wirral Unitary Development Plan, 2000 which seeks to ensure that house extensions, amongst other criteria, do not dominate the existing building and use materials to match or complement the existing building.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INPSECTOR