



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/25/3360504

28 Cinnamon Lane, Poulton-with-Fearnhead, Warrington, WA2 0BB

- 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 Stuart Halliwell against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/00713/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use from a residential annex to an Airbnb holiday let.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for change of use from a residential annex to an Airbnb holiday let, at 28 Cinnamon Lane, Poulton-with-Fearnhead, Warrington, WA2 0BB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/00713/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted relates to drawing numbers DP2425-PL-01 Rev.A (site location and block plans) and DP2425-PL-03 (proposed plans and elevations).
 - 3) The appeal building shall be occupied as a residential annex or visitor/holiday accommodation only, and shall at no time be occupied as any person's sole or main place of residence. An up to date register of bookings shall be kept by the owner and shall be made available for inspection by the local planning authority upon request. The register shall contain details of the names of all of the occupiers of the accommodation, their main home addresses and their date of arrival and departure from the accommodation.
 - 4) The appeal building shall remain in the same ownership as the owner(s) and occupier(s) of the host dwelling at 28 Cinnamon Lane at all times.

Background and Preliminary Matters

2. Whilst reference is made to the use of the appeal building as an art studio, the planning history confirms the building is simply a residential outbuilding, the use of which is currently conditioned to remain ancillary to the occupation of the dwelling, and not to be occupied separately, or used for any trade or business.
3. The Council determined the application on the basis that the annex building would be severed from the existing dwelling and its curtilage, for use as a separate standalone dwelling house. However, permission is sought specifically to use the annex as an Airbnb holiday let, which can be controlled by conditions. Internal alterations to the building, comprising the removal of an internal wall and the

provision of a small kitchenette area, would not require planning permission, and would not automatically result in a material change of use.

4. At the time of my visit, the building contained no cooking or laundry facilities, and the scale of the kitchenette annotated on the proposed ground floor plans would not be sufficient to provide all of the necessary facilities required for day to day living, such as a fridge-freezer, oven and hob, washing up facilities, washing machine, and worktop and dining space. Moreover, the red line boundary is drawn tightly around the building and does not include any separate curtilage or parking provisions. There are no plans to sub-divide the plot and there is no evidence before me to suggest the annex building has a separate address or separate council tax and utility bills to the main house. On this basis I do not consider the building should be treated as a standalone dwelling. It is, and would remain, an ancillary annex to the main house.
5. The submitted plan shows the whole of the adjoining semi-detached house at No.30 Cinnamon Lane, and its curtilage, outlined in blue, indicating that it is within the appellant's ownership and control. However, I noted at the time of my visit that this property has been sold. I have therefore considered the effect of the development on future occupiers of this neighbouring property.

Main Issues

6. The appeal building would continue to form an annex to the existing dwelling, but when not in use by the occupiers of the main house, would be let out as Airbnb visitor accommodation. The main issues are therefore the effect of the development on i) the living conditions of occupiers of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties with regard to privacy, noise, odour and disturbance; and ii) car parking and highway safety.

Reasons

Living conditions

7. The two-storey flat roof appeal building is situated in the rear garden of No.28 Cinnamon Lane. It comprises a ground floor living room and a store, with a bedroom and en-suite shower room above. There is a ground floor terrace to the front covered by a steel framed glass roof canopy. The terrace and the large, glazed sliding doors and first floor windows all face directly towards the enclosed rear garden and rear elevation of the main dwelling. There is an external door to the rear of the building, which currently only serves the storage area under the stairs. There is also a rear window at the top of the stairs.
8. Access to the building is currently via the garden and a key safe is located outside of the front sliding doors. It is proposed to remove the internal wall between the store and the living room to provide additional means of entry and exit to the building via the rear door. A small kitchenette area is also proposed, which based upon its size would only be likely to provide very basic facilities such as a fridge, kettle and toaster for making drinks and light snacks, which is commensurate with most visitor accommodation.
9. The building is bound on two sides by a shared private access road serving several properties. It is bound on the other two sides by the host dwelling, which it would remain part of, and by the garden of No.30 Cinnamon Lane.

10. I acknowledge that short term lets are used differently to dwellings with their occupants changing regularly. Although there is very little information before me regarding the intended frequency and duration of lets, the size of the building would not lend itself to large families or groups and is more likely to be let by professionals travelling for work, or couples. As such, the increase in comings and goings would be minimal and would not generate any more noise or disturbance than the use of an ancillary annex occupied by family members.
11. Noise levels from guests sitting out on the terrace, alongside the garden of the main dwelling, would be unlikely to be any different to that already experienced from the garden when the appellant's family are using their outdoor space. As the terrace is covered by a glass roof it would not be suitable for barbeques and fire pits, the use of which would generate no additional or greater odour than the existing residential garden space. Given the close relationship between the annex and the main dwelling, and the shared parking and garden space, I have no reason to doubt that the Airbnb would be strictly managed.
12. Even if the building was altered internally to enable access via the rear door, and screening was provided between the terrace and the remainder of the garden, the privacy between occupiers of No.28 and the Airbnb would be compromised by the limited separation distance between first floor windows. However, provided the appeal building and the main dwelling remain in the same ownership, the occupiers of the dwelling would have control over the timing and duration of stays, and it would be their choice to be overlooked, and to share their parking, bins and garden space with visitors.
13. Subject to a condition preventing the annex from being occupied as a sole or main place of residence, I do not consider the Nationally Described Space Standards and accessibility requirements for new dwellings to be applicable. Visitors with any special requirements would be able to confirm whether the accommodation meets their needs prior to booking. As visitors would be staying temporarily and not living in the building, they would not require the same level of storage or privacy as permanent residents, and reliance upon blinds or curtains for privacy would be acceptable. Any waste generated by the occupancy of the building as Airbnb accommodation would be minimal, and such premises would usually be serviced and cleaned by the owners, using their own waste and recycling bins to dispose of waste.
14. The reasons for refusal do not refer to any loss of privacy to any other neighbours. From the first-floor rear window I was able to see over part of the front garden of the bungalow known as Beauhaven, which is at an oblique angle to the site. I was not able to see any windows of this property or into its rear garden. There are no existing or proposed openings in either side elevation of the building. From the large full length first floor windows I was able to see some limited glimpsed views into parts of the rear garden of No.30. However, views towards the rear windows and garden of this property are significantly reduced due to the presence of existing mature trees. I could not see into the windows or rear garden of No.26A Cinnamon Lane. In any event the annex and its windows are existing and overlooking by Airbnb guests would be no greater than that of existing users.

15. I therefore conclude that the use of the existing residential annex as an Airbnb would not adversely affect the living conditions of occupiers of the main dwelling or neighbouring properties. As such there would be no conflict with policies DC6 and ENV8 of the Warrington Local Plan 2021/22 – 2038/39 (the local plan), which seek to ensure amongst other things that development does not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Parking and highway safety

16. The well-established shared private access road to the side and rear of the appeal site serves several dwellings, albeit all but Beauhaven have pedestrian access, and some have additional vehicular access, from Cinnamon Lane, Appletree Grove or Parkfield Lane. Nos.4 and 8 Parkfield Lane only have vehicle access from the private road.
17. There is no compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that the private access road is unsafe or that any accidents have been caused as a result of its width, loose surface or visibility onto Cinnamon Lane. I understand that in the past, both Nos.28 and 30 Cinnamon Lane had garages to the rear, accessed via the private drive. However, No.30 now has a vehicular access to the front. I am advised that the residents of No.28 have always parked along the side of the private road, which is partially within their ownership.
18. I acknowledge the concerns of neighbours relating to existing parking along roads in the area obstructing driveways and visibility, and whilst I accept that most visitors staying at the Airbnb would be likely to arrive by car, given the limited size of the accommodation, it would only generate one additional car at a time. This would have a negligible effect on the use of the shared private access road, the adjoining public highway and car parking in the vicinity of the site.
19. Visitors would be advised where to park when booking and there is space to park three cars along the widest part of the private access road without causing any obstruction. The Council's parking standards recommend three spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms and advises that on-street parking adjacent to new development can be counted towards this provision. Unrestricted car parking is also available along Cinnamon Lane, and I noted that most houses in the area have their own off street parking spaces. The use of the annex as a holiday let would be unlikely to generate any greater traffic movement or parking demand than its lawful use as an ancillary annex to the main house, which could be occupied for example as a granny annex or by other family members.
20. In the unlikely event of visitors arriving by bicycle or bringing bicycles with them, these could be safely stored on the covered terrace immediately outside of the annex, or elsewhere within the appellant's garden. I also noticed that there are shops, and eating and drinking establishments close by, which could be accessed on foot, and that there are bus stops nearby offering alternative means of transport to various destinations.
21. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable parking effects or harm to highway safety. As such it would accord with policy INF1 of the local plan, which seeks amongst other things to support development in sustainable locations and to ensure the traffic generated by development is appropriate to the type and nature of the routes available, and would have no adverse impact on the local community.

Conditions

22. Whilst I understand the building has briefly been used as an Airbnb, this use appears to have ceased after the owners were advised to submit a planning application. Accordingly, I have imposed the standard time limit condition for the commencement of the approved use. I have conditioned the approved drawing numbers to provide certainty as to what has been granted planning permission, however, there is no requirement or timescale to undertake any internal works as these are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
23. Having regard to the limited space within the building, the limited separation distance between the annex and the main house, and the shared nature of the garden, car parking, bin and bicycle storage, the annex would not be suitable for use as an independent standalone dwelling. As such it is necessary to impose conditions to ensure the annex is not used as such, and it remains ancillary to, and in the same ownership and control as the main dwelling, and that its commercial use is limited to holiday/visitor accommodation only.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR