



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 July 2021

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4325/D/21/3278128

37 Allport Road, Bromborough CH62 6AA

- 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 Miss Louise Threlfall against the decision of Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/20/01292, dated 11 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a porch on front of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a porch on front of house at 37 Allport Road, Bromborough CH62 6AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/20/01292, dated 11 September 2020.

Preliminary Matters

2. The porch has been erected in accordance with the submitted plans. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. On 20 July 2021 a revised National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') was issued replacing the version of the Framework published in 2019. However, it does not change design policy in relation to the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling within an area predominately characterised by residential properties with some variation in their type, style and design. Allport Road is a long road. The appeal property lies between the junctions of the road with Allport Lane/Bridle Road and New Chester Road. There are examples of porches to nearby properties.
6. The porch serves the front door to the property and it has a pitched roof which is below the first-floor window above. The porch maybe around 0.2 metres deeper than the depth set out in the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), but the scale of the porch does not dominate the existing property or the plot having regard to saved Policy HS11 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (UDP).
7. The design of the porch differs from the host dwelling. This is emphasised by

the timber frame and the use of glass. Thus, the porch is not of a design or finish that matches the character and design of the dwelling. However, the criteria in the SPG are more restrictive than saved UDP Policy HS11 which allows for 'materials matching or complementing those of the existing building' and 'design features...matching or complementing those of the existing building'.

8. The pitched roof design of the porch responds to the host property and neighbouring properties, whilst the use of glass complements the host property's windows in its front elevation. Notably, other porches in the road do use glass in their elevations. The use of a timber frame is a departure from the established palate of materials locally, and although it contrasts with the rendered finish to the dwelling, I consider that it is complementary. Overall, the porch is not incongruous in the road and despite the conflict with the SPG, I consider its scale is appropriate for the plot, and its design and the use of materials complement the existing building.
9. I conclude that the porch does not harm the character and appearance of the area and accords with saved UDP Policy HS11 and paragraphs 126 and 130 of the Framework. My findings in respect of these outweigh the conflict identified with the SPG.

Conditions

10. As the porch is in situ and the development carried out in accordance with the submitted plan, the standard time period condition and an approved plan condition are not necessary.

Conclusion

11. The proposal accords with the Development Plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR