



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2025

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3373729

Bellefield, Faulkners Lane, Mobberley, Cheshire East WA16 7AL

- 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 & Mrs Dobson against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/1147/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is front enclosed porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front enclosed porch extension at Bellefield, Faulkners Lane, Cheshire East WA16 7AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/1147/HOUS, 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:
 - Location Plan;
 - Drawing Nos:
 - PL.00.01A – Proposed Plans and Elevations;
 - PL.00.02 – Proposed Site Plan; and
 - PL.0C.03 – Tree Protection Plan.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: -
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant development plan policies and its effect on openness; 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 necessary to justify the proposal.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a large detached house that has previously been extended. It is in a row of houses, with other houses and a church on the opposite side of the road. Whilst it is located within an area comprising a number of buildings, it is within the Green Belt.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) explains that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It makes it clear that development is considered inappropriate unless it satisfies one of the exceptions cited in paragraphs 154 or 155. Paragraph 154, sub-section c) allows 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. This is reflected in Local Plan Strategy¹ Policy PG 3. Policy RUR 11 of the Site Allocations and Development Plan Document (SADPD)² sets out further criteria for extensions and alterations to buildings outside settlement boundaries. This includes development in the Green Belt and in the open countryside. Within the Green Belt it reflects the Framework and Policy PG 3 and also expands on acceptable exceptions. I shall refer to these later.
5. The proposal would add a porch onto the front of the house. In itself this is a relatively modest addition to the existing dwelling. However, the Framework is clear that the impact on the Green Belt for extensions or alterations relates to the original building. The Council calculate that the existing extensions increase the floorspace of the original dwelling by approximately 64%. The proposal would raise this to about 70%. Policy RUR 11 advises that an increase above 30% will usually be considered to represent a disproportionate addition.
6. However, Policy RUR 11 also indicates that when considering disproportionate additions, matters including height, bulk, form, siting and design will be taken into account. Furthermore, it also suggests exceptions to the size threshold, including, amongst other things, where there is no significant alteration to the building's envelope or external appearance. It cites basements as an example. The proposal would increase the building's envelope and being on the front of the house, it would also affect its appearance. However, the increase above that which has already been allowed is small. The proposed porch would not project beyond part of the front wall of the house; a front projection at ground floor level projects further. It would be single storey and only extend across part of the building's frontage. Its impact on the Green Belt would therefore be neutral.
7. The Council accept that in context, the proposal would be proportionate in scale, bulk and mass. It would not be prominent and it would appear subservient to the existing dwelling. I agree with this. I therefore, consider that although spatially, the proposal would increase the size of the dwelling, visually, no harm would arise. Furthermore, it would not conflict with the purposes of Green Belt due to its small scale and the location of Bellefield amongst other houses.
8. Notwithstanding that the proposal exceeds the threshold for disproportionate additions to a dwelling in the Green Belt when taken together with the previous

¹ Cheshire East Council – Cheshire East Local Plan Local Plan Strategy 2010 – 2030 July 2017.

² Cheshire East Council – Cheshire East Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document, Adopted December 2022 (SADPD).

extensions, given the scale of the proposal, I do not consider it to be inappropriate development. I therefore find that the proposal would fall under the exception cited in paragraph 154 c) of the Framework. As such, it would not be inappropriate development and there is no need for me to consider the impact on openness. There is also no need for me to take into account any other considerations that may amount to very special circumstances.

9. I conclude that the proposal would not be inappropriate development and would not conflict with Local Plan Policy PG 3 or SADPD Policy RUR 11 nor would it conflict with the Framework.

Other Matters

10. The appellants have cited a number of applications in the area where extensions have been approved above the 30% threshold. This indicates that, in accordance with the relevant policies larger extensions can be permitted. It does not however indicate that this is the case in all circumstances and each application would have to be considered on its own merits. I also note that the Council has not raised any adverse effects regarding the design of the proposal, the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or any highway issues. I have no reason to come to any other conclusion on these matters.
11. The proposal is within the Mobberley Conservation Area but no concerns have been raised about the effect of the proposal on the significance of the Conservation Area. However, in reaching my decision I have had regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. I consider that the proposal would have a neutral effect.
12. I note that there is a mature Oak tree to the front of the house and the submitted plans include details of tree protection measures. The proposed extension would not be so close to the tree to cause harm and the protective fencing would ensure that it was safeguarded during construction.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. It is also necessary that the materials used in the construction of the porch match the existing dwelling in order to achieve a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR