



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3368997

5 Woodlands Road, Disley, Stockport SK12 2LU

- 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 Andrea Dawson against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/4812/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension, front Dutch gables altered to form gables and alterations to doors and windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;
 - the effect on the openness of the Green Belt; and
 - whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

3. The appeal site lies within the designated Green Belt and is a previously extended detached dwelling in an area characterised by individually designed detached dwellings.
4. Paragraph 142 of the Framework outlines the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy which is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The Framework, at paragraphs 154 and 155, sets out the categories of development which may be regarded as not inappropriate in the Green Belt, subject to certain conditions.
5. Paragraph 154c) sets out that development within the Green Belt is inappropriate unless the extension or alteration of a building does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
6. The Framework does not define what a disproportionate addition would be. An assessment of whether the proposal would be disproportionate to the original

building is therefore a matter of planning judgement but the overall size of the building (either in terms of footprint, floorspace or volume) is clearly an important factor. An original building, the Framework explains, is a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if it was constructed after that date, as it was built originally. Policy RUR11 of the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (2022) (SADPD) seeks to protect the Green Belt by limiting the increase in size of the original building to no more than 30%.

7. Whilst there are no plans of the original building, both parties agree that the dwelling has been increased through previous extensions. The extensions now proposed, in addition to those already constructed, would significantly increase the floorspace and massing, particularly of the first floor. Even if I agree with the appellants calculations that the proposal would lead to a 37.47% increase over and above the size of the original dwelling, this would still be a greater increase than would meet the provisions of Policy RUR11.
8. Another way of assessing the matter is to consider the visual impact of the proposal against the appearance of the original building. In this case, when combined with the existing extensions, the bulk and massing particularly of the increase in ridge height over the existing garage and changes to the Dutch gables, would result in an extension that would not be subservient to the dwelling. As such it would be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
9. Taking the above factors into account, the proposal would represent a disproportionate addition to the dwelling and would not therefore fall within the exception set out in paragraph 154c) of the Framework. It therefore follows that it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would also be contrary to Policy PG3 of the Cheshire Local Plan Strategy (2017) (CELPS) and Policy RUR11 of the SADPD which have similar aims.

Openness

10. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics are their openness and permanence. The openness of the Green Belt has a spatial as well as a visual aspect, so the physical and visual presence of built forms may affect openness.
11. The proposal would increase the mass and bulk of the building at first floor level as a result of the two-storey extension and the replacement of the Dutch gables with gables. Consequently, albeit to a limited degree, the proposal would, in both visual and spatial terms, harm the openness of the Green Belt.
12. For the above reasons the proposal would cause limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt in addition to harm by reason of being inappropriate. I therefore conclude that the development would lead to a harmful loss of Green Belt openness, contrary to the main aims of the Green Belt policy set out in the Framework.

Other Considerations

13. The Framework states that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the development, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

14. I acknowledge that the proposal would create an annex for a family member to create a multi-generational household, would help to reduce housing pressures in the local area and contribute to sustainable development. These benefits attract moderate weight in favour of the proposal.

Green Belt Balance

15. The Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Therefore, substantial weight should be given to the harm to the Green Belt. The Framework states that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the development, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
16. For the reasons set out above, the development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Furthermore, there would be limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Paragraph 153 of the Framework states that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.
17. Taking into account all of the other considerations put forward in support of the proposal, I consider that these attract moderate weight in favour of it. Therefore, in considering the substantial weight given to the Green Belt, I conclude that the very special circumstances needed to justify the development in the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. As such the proposal would conflict with the Framework, Policy PG3 of the CELPS and Policy RUR11 of the SADPD which together seek to protect the Green Belt.

Conclusion

18. 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 the appeal should be dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR