



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/25/3360231

126 Field Street, Liverpool L3 8BY

- 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 Mr Mosharraf Hossain Sarker against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24H/2467.
 - The development is a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has been started and, although described as incomplete on the application form, I was able to view the entirety of the front porch at my site visit. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that permission is being sought retrospectively for the erection of the porch.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - the occupant's personal circumstances and need for the development with regard to accessibility and mobility impairments.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey terrace house within a street of similar houses. The surrounding area has a suburban residential character derived from houses laid out in semi-detached pairs or in terraced rows. Field Street has the distinctive characteristic of terraced houses fronting onto a pedestrianised walkway. Houses on the street are constructed from brick, variously and intentionally painted red, rendered or left exposed. The front elevation of each house is divided equally in two using this architectural treatment. To one half of the front elevation of each house is a pitched canopy that extends over the front entrance door and access to the rear garden. The street is on rising ground such that the terraced rows step up the slope revealing a regular pattern of part gable ends and chimneys. The street has a strong rhythm and consistent pattern of development that remains predominantly unaltered.
5. The development is a front entrance porch that runs across the front elevation of the house and into the front garden. The porch is wider than the original entrance canopy it replaces and, due to its increased depth, has a larger and higher roof plane. As

such, it is a departure from the existing appearance of the host property and does not respect the original architecture of the house. It is a prominent addition to the street scene. Moreover, the narrow pedestrianised nature of the street and modest front garden means the porch appears in close proximity when viewed from the street. The porch is at odds with the prevailing pattern and strong rhythm of development and has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. I saw at my site visit that a front entrance porch has also been added to No 130 in the same terraced row as the appeal property. However, that porch is smaller in depth and width and more closely aligns with the appearance of the existing entrance canopies. Moreover, I have little information relating to the circumstances of this development and its status regarding planning permission. As such, comparison is of limited relevance in this instance.
7. I note that there are no objections to the development from neighbouring occupants and I am told that all neighbours the appellant has spoken to are supportive of the porch. The neighbours have not put anything in writing, but even if they had it would not alter my conclusion that the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Turning to the matter of personal circumstances I have found that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. I attach substantial weight to this finding against the appeal.
9. I recognise that the porch would enhance accessibility and usability of the house for individuals with impaired mobility. However, since the appellant has not shown that the size of the porch is no larger than necessary and has been properly designed to meet its purpose, I can only attach moderate weight in favour of the grant of permission.
10. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under s149 of the Equality Act 2010, but the harm caused by the development outweighs its benefit in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of disability, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others. I conclude that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.
11. Taking the above into account, I conclude that the development would result in a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Hence, it would conflict with Policy H8 of the City of Liverpool Unitary Development Plan, November 2002, and UD1 and UD7 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033, January 2022, which seek, among other things, to ensure that development respects the scale, proportion, form and pattern of existing development.

Conclusion

12. The development conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR