



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/25/3360590

297 Chester Road, Grappenhall and Thelwall, Warrington WA4 2QQ

- 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 Sam Coombes against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/01161/FULH.
 - The development is described as 'new front porch.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Since the development has been carried out, retrospective planning permission has been sought. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a semi-detached, 2-storey dwelling within a residential area, fronting onto Chester Road. Its position is set back from the road behind a paved driveway area. Within the immediate area there is a consistency to the design, form and materials of the dwellings, the latter being predominantly red brick and render walling and tiled roofs. As a semi-detached dwelling consistent with repeated house types, the appeal site contributes positively to the character of the area.
6. The porch has a front facing gable which contrasts with the main hipped roof and the lean-to roof above the front bay window. It extends beyond the front building line, as well as the side elevation of the dwelling, overlapping and concealing the ground floor brick quoin detailing. The form and position of the porch do not relate positively to the host dwelling and despite being relatively small, results in a bulky addition. Its impact is exacerbated by the use of timber cladding which contrasts starkly against the brick and render finish of the host, giving an appearance akin to a domestic shed. The form, position and external appearance of the porch therefore results in a jarring addition that stands out incongruously within the street scene.

7. In regard to the reference to the previously approved extension to the rear by the appellant, I have not been passed any further details or can be sure if the permission is still extant. In any event the presence of an extension in a less visible context would not alleviate the harm I have identified in regard to the impact on the street scene arising from this proposal.
8. Whilst there are other porches within the wider area, these are more modestly proportioned and use matching materials. I note the appellant's view that the area has a variation in the design of its built form. However, from my observations the level of individualisation of the appeal scheme is not appropriate for a residential area with a cohesive identity and a consistency in materials.
9. The appeal scheme therefore causes harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy DC6 of the Warrington Local Plan (2023) which amongst other things, seeks to ensure that new development respects, sustains and makes a positive contribution to local character, including through the use of appropriate materials. With specific reference to domestic additions, these objectives are shared with the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2021). The proposal would also fail to comply with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote good design through development that is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellant's desire to create more usable space and storage for their family. However, private benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue. There are likely to be other ways of providing additional storage space without causing the harm identified.
11. The appellant also refers to a fallback position of erecting a porch extension under the allowances of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Specifically, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class D. To be permitted development (PD), a porch would need to comply with the relevant conditions including the distance to the shared and external boundaries. It is not clear whether this is possible. Even so, a PD scheme is likely to be smaller and therefore less harmful than the proposal before me.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes - INSPECTOR