

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026

by **K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2026

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/25/3376676**

**129 Great Norbury Street, Hyde, Tameside SK14 1HT**

- 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 Johirul Choudhury against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/00762/FUL.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a front porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, a front porch had already been constructed. However, reference to 'retrospective' within the above description of development has been omitted as this does not constitute an act of development. Furthermore, I observed that the submitted plans are not a true reflection of the porch constructed and contain discrepancies with regard to its width, the side window fenestration, the relationship with the low side boundary wall and existing architectural features. For clarity, I have proceeded with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought for the development in accordance with the drawings submitted.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the porch on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property sits within a traditional terrace row, with each dwelling featuring a small forecourt enclosed by low brick walls with decorative copings and railings. The terrace is characterised by a strong and uniform rhythm, with a flush frontage interrupted only by a limited number of original ground floor bay windows. While some minor alterations have occurred, such as changes to window and door fenestration, the defining original architectural features and character of the host dwelling and remainder of the row have been retained. The wider area is similarly defined by traditional terraced housing, which establishes the distinctive residential character of the locality.
5. The external materials specified for the front porch would comprise red bricks, white upvc boarding and concrete interlocking tiles to the mono-pitch roof. The siting of the porch, as shown on the plan, would appear to conflict with the existing

low side boundary wall and would leave part of the architectural feature head over the original entrance door visible to the side.

6. The Council has referred to the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (March 2010) (the SPD) which provides guidance on how residential extensions should integrate, and be in keeping with, the character of the house and wider area in terms of the style, materials and scale.
7. Having regard to the submitted plans and the SPD guidance, I find that the design, siting and materials of the proposed porch would fail to respect, complement or enhance the existing character and appearance of the host dwelling resulting in a contrived and inappropriate addition. Furthermore, the introduction of a projecting front porch would harmfully disrupt the uniformity and rhythm of this terraced row. I therefore find that the porch would not represent high-quality attractive development and would not be in keeping with the prevailing character of the surrounding area.
8. The case is made that porches are common locally and several examples in the wider area have been highlighted. However, aside from 161 Great Norbury Street (No 161), there is no evidence before me regarding the circumstances of their construction or their status with regard to planning permission. In the case of No 161, the Council confirms that the porch does not benefit from planning permission. In any event, the appearance of the porch at No 161 does not convince me that it should set the pattern for development on this part of Great Norbury Street.
9. The porches at 77 Croft Street and 46 Chapel Street are broadly similar to the appeal development, whereas those at 94 Croft Street and 8 Perrin Street differ in design and appear longstanding. The porch at 90 Great Norbury Street sits beneath an existing canopy, reducing its visual impact but, nonetheless, results in a contrived addition. Rather than providing justification for the development in question, if anything, the presence of each of these porches points to a need for such proposals to be carefully controlled if the character and appearance of the area is to be safeguarded. I have therefore considered the appeal before me on the basis of its individual planning merits.
10. Overall, I conclude that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. This is contrary to Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of The Tameside Unitary Development Plan (November 2004) which, amongst other things, together seek to secure high quality attractive development which respects the surrounding fabric, complementing or enhancing the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

### **Other Matters**

11. I acknowledge that a significant number of the representations received support the development, citing its modern appearance, lack of perceived harm and the additional space it would provide for the occupants of the dwelling. However, these views do not outweigh the concerns I have identified above.
12. While no concerns have been raised with regard to highway safety, the avoidance of harm in this respect does not amount to a benefit, rather it is an expectation of local and national policies.

13. The appellant suggests that all of the concerns raised could be overcome by the imposition of conditions, which could require a reduction of the porch projection and address the poor construction standard, with regard to remedial works or alternative materials. However, no such scheme is before me, and I am not satisfied that conditions as suggested would meet the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and advice provided in the Planning Practice Guidance.
14. The appellant contends that the refusal hinders the ability of residents to undertake modest improvements to their homes. This appeal, however, has been determined on its individual planning merits, and would not preclude any resident from submitting a planning application for residential extensions.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the harm resulting from the porch means that the development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

*K Mee*

INSPECTOR