
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by **B Astley-Serougi BA(Hons) LLM MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/24/3353554

**Kylemoor Cottage, Causeway Bridges Farm, Old Alder Lane, Burtonwood
WA5 4BN**

- 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 M Fairclough against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 2024/00490/FULH.
- The development proposed is described as extension to first floor over existing approved ground floor.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed extension would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;
 - the effect of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt; and
 - whether other considerations clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, so as to amount to very special circumstances.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) establishes that the extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate as long as they do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This is reflected in Policy GB1 of the Warrington Local Plan 2021/22 – 2038/39 (the WLP).
4. The previously approved and therefore original dwelling had a floor area of approximately 87.85m² and a volume of 293m³. The appeal scheme would introduce a second story which would result in an approximate addition of 84m² which would equate to an approximate increase of 95.7% in floor space and 60.75% in volume.

5. The House Extension Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (the SPD) states that any extensions and additions that result in an increase in size of over 33% of the original building will be considered to be disproportionate and consequently unacceptable.
6. Given the above, the appeal scheme would constitute inappropriate development due to the significant increase of floor space and volume which would result from an additional first floor. It would therefore conflict with Policy GB1 of the WLP insofar as it seeks to ensure that development in the Green Belt is not inappropriate. It is for the same reason that the appeal scheme would also fail to accord with the aims of the SPD.

Openness

7. Planning Practice Guidance sets out factors that can be taken into account when considering the openness of the Green Belt. It outlines that the openness of the Green Belt includes but is not limited to both spatial and visual aspects, duration and remediability and degree of activity¹.
8. The proposed development would create a second storey and given that I have identified above that it would result in an approximate increase of 95.7% in floor space, it would have more of an impact on openness of the Green Belt in spatial terms than the existing circumstances.
9. The appeal site is located adjacent to large farm buildings and mature trees, the latter of which would offer some screening. Consequently, the appeal scheme would not result in a significant effect on the visual openness of the Green Belt.
10. Nevertheless, it remains that the appeal scheme would result in substantial harm to the spatial aspect of the openness of the Green Belt.

Other considerations and very special circumstances

11. The appeal scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 153 of the Framework advises that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. It also indicates that inappropriate development is by definition harmful and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances'. These will not exist unless potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
12. The appellant indicates that the appeal scheme is needed for an experienced farm manager, that all the applications to date have been for a family residence and that a bungalow is inadequate for a family. However, the appellant has not adequately demonstrated the need for an experienced farm manager and moreover, why the existing bungalow would not be adequate.
13. In conclusion, the appellant has not adequately demonstrated that the very special circumstances necessary to justify the appeal scheme exist.

¹ Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 64-013-20250225

Conclusion

14. The proposal 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 should be dismissed.

B Astley-Serougi

INSPECTOR