



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/25/3372330

53 Warrington Road, Lymm, Warrington WA13 9BS

- 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 Mrs Nancy Harrington against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/00754/FULH.
 - The development proposed is removal of pitched and flat roof to garage, playroom, utility and lobby and construction of pitched roof and open oak post porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and
 - Would any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether Inappropriate Development

4. The appeal site consists of a free-standing dwelling located within the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that new buildings within the Green Belt are inappropriate subject to a number of exceptions.
5. The Council's Planning Officer Report refers to the exception of Paragraph 154(c) of the Framework which relates to the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

6. With regard to development in the Green Belt, the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (the SPD) sets out that any extension or additions that result in an increase in size of over 33% of the original building will be considered disproportionate. The Council has provided evidence that the original building has already been extended to a degree that significantly exceeds the 33% threshold given in the SPD. Any further extension would therefore add to the existing disproportionate extensions. Although the increase in volume and floorspace resulting from the proposal would be very limited, this does not negate the cumulative disproportionate nature of extensions to the building.
7. Reference has also been made to Prior Approvals and a Lawful Development Certificate relating to potential extensions and alterations to the property. However, even if these are not implemented, this does not lead me to a different conclusion on the disproportionate effect of the proposal based on the existing extensions.
8. Based on the evidence before me, the proposal would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The proposal would therefore be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

Other Considerations

9. The proposed pitched roof would replace a small pitched roof and a flat roof over a ground floor offshoot to the side of the dwelling. The current arrangement appears as a disjointed roofscape, and the proposal would represent an improvement due to its cohesive design which complements the host building. In that respect, the proposal would comply with the advice of the SPD in respect of complementing the roof and harmonising with the design of the existing house. The porch would be an open-sided structure that would also complement the extant dwelling. Matching materials could be secured by condition.
10. Although the appeal site, including the side offshoot, is visible from Warrington Road, the offshoot is not a prominent or unduly obtrusive feature in views of the dwelling. Therefore, although the proposal would represent an improvement in design compared to the extant building, the benefits to character and appearance would be of a limited degree.
11. The appellant also refers to section 5 of Policy GB1 of the Warrington Local Plan 2023 (the Local Plan). However, this policy relates to settlements that are inset (that is excluded) from the Green Belt. Although Lymm is one of the settlements listed, it has not been demonstrated that the appeal site is part of the inset settlement, and the Council has specified that the site is within the Green Belt. Based on the evidence before me, section 5 of Policy GB1 does not relate to the appeal site.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and the Framework requires that substantial weight should be given to any harm. The benefits arising from the proposal would be of limited weight. There are therefore no other considerations which clearly outweigh the identified harm. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy GB1 of the Local Plan regarding

development proposals in the Green Belt. The proposal would also not comply with the advice of the SPD in respect of disproportionate extensions in the Green Belt.

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR