



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/25/3361522

10 Lymmington Avenue, Lymm, Warrington WA13 9NQ

- 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 Nicholas Schonert against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/01303/FULH.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear/ side extension. Loft Conversion including dormers. Internal alterations. Demolition of detached garage.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a semi detached bungalow which fronts a linear street comprising similar buildings. Some have been altered, including loft conversions, but there remains a quality to the street scene's original consistency in the repetition of hipped roof forms and dwellings of a modest stature. These elements contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The number, size and shape of the front dormers would subsume a significant amount of the roof, appearing as large, boxy and dominating additions thereto. This, along with the gable conversion to the side, would alter the originality of the characteristic hipped roof and, accordingly, unacceptably jar with the quality of the street scene's consistency. These matters would be exacerbated by the visual prominence of the works being to the public face of the building.
6. There are various examples of front dormers locally. However, they are generally more modest and singular which limits their effect and reflects the subservience of the attic floor. There are also gables in the street, but they tend to be on a lower part of the building and in the case of some conversions, they do not represent the prevailing originality of the area to the point that my findings would change.

7. The proposed development would therefore have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such it would fail to comply with Policy DC6 of the Warrington Local Plan 2023 which requires, amongst other things, development to respect, sustain and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness within the surrounding area.

Other Matters

8. I am aware of works to the roof that could take place by virtue of allowances under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Other such schemes may have taken place or be pending doing so on other buildings locally. However, it appears the proposals before me are not and subject to consideration as such. It is, moreover, clear from my findings on the appeal scheme that it is the totality of the works that would give rise to the harm in regard to their scale, number and design specifically. Finally, I do not have an alternative design before me to consider a realistic 'fallback' position to compare to the appeal proposals. This would, to establish its lawfulness in any event, have to be presented to the Council for consideration and not for me to determine here.
9. I appreciate the need for additional space at the property, but the benefits associated with such would be of a private nature and thus worthy of only limited weight. As would the possibility of economic enhancements locally through the construction industry and expenditure since they would be constrained by the scale of the works and time limited. Any concerns with the Council's conduct during the life of the planning application should be taken up with them directly.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR