



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2025

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4325/D/25/3369846

Frensham, 26 Park West, Heswall, Wirral, CH60 9JF

- 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 Andrew Mills against the decision of Wirral Council.
- The application Ref is APPH/25/00575.
- The development proposed is First floor rear extension to provide additional bedroom with ensuite and inverted balcony, together with an additional dormer window on the front elevation.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for First floor rear extension to provide additional bedroom with ensuite and inverted balcony, together with an additional dormer window on the front elevation at Frensham, 26 Park West, Heswall, Wirral, CH60 9JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APPH/25/00575 and the plans submitted with it. subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby approved shall begin within three years of the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the following approved plans: 2025/10/P1 rev. B; 2025/10/P2 rev. C.
 - 3) The additional front dormer shall be constructed of matching materials, and notwithstanding the drawings approved, construction of the rear extension shall not commence unless and until construction drawings have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. These drawings shall demonstrate, at a scale of 1:50 or larger, that the development hereby approved shall at no point be higher than 200mm below the existing ridge line of the host dwelling and shall also indicate the specification and colour of all external construction materials. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, if so, whether other considerations exist that clearly outweigh the harm to openness and any other harms which would arise from the development, or,

- if the development is not inappropriate, the effect of the proposed development on the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

3. Located in a rural setting within the North West Green Belt and grouped with several other houses of differing designs, Frensham 26 Park West (No.26) is a detached single storey house with accommodation in the roof space in a generously sized domestic plot. Originally built some 60 years previously, the appellant intends to add an upper storey to a single storey rear extension¹, which would adjoin a wide box dormer on the rear roof slope.
4. Development in the Green Belt is, by definition, inappropriate, unless it follows identified exceptions. Extensions to existing buildings are not inappropriate unless of disproportionate size, and in that regard the Framework requires consideration of the degree of change from the 'original building'. The Council have put forward an assessment as to the change in floor area, however, this is not wholly consistent with paragraph 154 of the Framework, which refers to 'size'. The proposal would add around 30m² of floor area at the upper level, such that additions to the original building would (at 61%) be greater than that guided by the Council's House Extensions SPD (2004). However, the Courts² indicate that in consideration of disproportionality, comparative assessment against the original building should be objective, but also that there could be a number of relevant factors such as built volume and height. In this case, the upper-level extension to the existing ground floor extension would remain within the existing roof height and not increase the footprint. Moreover, although the proposal would add to the original built form, it would lack any roof volume³. The Council's assessment does not account for such factors and therefore should attract only moderate weight.
5. The proposal would be contained within the existing footprint and building height, and although partly visible in the street scene, it would be located within an established area of residential development, and I consider its impact on openness would therefore be negligible. Although I have no calculations by which to compare volumes, and it is likely that further additions beyond what is currently proposed would be cumulatively disproportionate, on balance I conclude the proposed extension would not be disproportionate in size, and therefore it would be not-inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

6. The Council's questionnaire suggests that the effect of the proposed development can be ascertained from public land, however, that is not the case. The existing building has a prominent rear box dormer and rear extension, to which the proposal would visually relate when considered from within the dwelling curtilage. Whilst the proposal would not be characteristic of the original built form, that character has evolved due to alteration and (rear) extension. The drawings submitted do not clearly indicate external materials proposed to be used. However, if the

¹ Also adding a dormer window to the front roof slope

² CoA in R (oao Heath and Hampstead Society), Camden LBC and Vlachos

³ Being flat-roofed, whereas other parts of the original building's floor area were likely provided with a steep-pitched roof.

development were erected within the height constraints of the existing (original) dwelling and in suitable materials, the degree of change to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, or the surrounding area, would not, bearing in mind the size of the plot and the variety of built forms in neighbouring dwellings, be visually obtrusive. I therefore conclude there would be no conflict with Policy WD5 of the Wirral Local Plan 2022-2040 (WLP), which seeks that residential extensions should accord with local context.

Conclusion

7. I have concluded that the proposed extension would not be disproportionate in size to the original dwelling and therefore would accord with the provisions of the Framework at paragraphs 153 and the exceptions provided at 154(c) for development in the Green Belt. I have also concluded that the proposed development would not, having regard to the circumstances of the site and setting, conflict with the provisions of the development plan in terms of character and appearance. Consequently, taking all matters raised into account, the appeal succeeds subject to the usual plans and timing conditions. A condition to ensure the building is constructed within the height constraints of the existing dwelling and in suitable materials is also necessary, having regard to the reasoning in my decision.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR