



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **B Astley-Serougi BA(Hons) LLM MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 OCTOBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3369200

235 Hithermoor Road, Stanwell Moor, Surrey TW19 6AZ

- 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 and Mrs Gill against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00380/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as first floor creating habitable accommodation to existing bungalow and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have removed words not in relation to acts of development from the above banner heading for clarity.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed extension would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;
 - the effect of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt; and
 - whether other considerations clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, so as to amount to very special circumstances.

Reasons

Inappropriate Development

4. The Framework establishes that the extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate as long as they do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This is reflected in Policy EN2 of the Spelthorne Borough Council Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 (the DPD) as well as Saved Policy GB1 of the Spelthorne Borough Council Local Plan 2001 'Saved' Policies and Proposals March 2008 (the SPP).
5. Whilst the aims of Policy EN2 of the DPD and Saved Policy GB1 is to prevent inappropriate development within the Green Belt, they do not provide, for example, an acceptable numerical threshold in matters relating to extensions of dwellings in the Green Belt. Therefore, in this case, it is a matter of planning judgement.

Consequently, figures relating to the original building size and the appeal scheme are significant material considerations.

6. Policy EN2 of the DPD is consistent with the Framework however, it goes on to require certain criterion to be met regarding the character and appearance of extensions on dwellings in the Greenbelt. Criteria a) requires that the development does not significantly change the scale of the original building, regardless of the size of the plot.
7. Annex 2 of the Framework defines the term 'original building' as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally. 235 Hithermoor Road (No 235) has a significant planning history which includes the erection of two single storey rear extensions. Consequently, they do not, in my judgement, constitute part of the original building in this case.
8. The appeal scheme would increase the original size of No 235 by around 118.59m² which would equate to an increase of approximately 56.29%. There is limited evidence before me to demonstrate that this figure includes the extant extensions. Nevertheless, even if it does include the additions, it would remain, to my mind, a significant increase in the scale of No 235 and result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.
9. The appeal scheme would comply with criteria b) of Policy EN2, in my judgement, which requires that development does not detract from the character of the area. This is because the appeal scheme would reflect the two-storey character of the locality, include gable ends with pitched roof slopes as well as use matching external materials. Additionally, Policy EN2(c) outlines that development should comply with Policy EN1 regarding design of new development, it is for the same reasons that I consider the appeal scheme to comply with this criteria.
10. Nevertheless, it remains that the proposal would, to my mind, conflict with criteria a) of Policy EN2 of the DPD and therefore would constitute disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
11. Given all of the above, it would conflict with Policy EN2 of the DPD and Saved Policy GB1 of the SPP insofar as they seek to ensure that development in the Green Belt is not inappropriate.

Openness

12. Planning Practice Guidance sets out factors that can be taken into account when considering the openness of the Green Belt. It outlines that the openness of the Green Belt includes but is not limited to both spatial and visual aspects, duration and remediability and degree of activity¹.
13. Whilst I acknowledge that the appeal scheme would not alter the footprint of the existing dwelling, it would create a second storey and result in an addition of approximately 118.59m². Consequently, in my judgement, it would have more of an impact on openness of the Green Belt in spatial terms than the existing circumstances.
14. The surrounding area of the appeal site is predominantly two storey in character and given that the appeal scheme would include gable ends with pitched roof

¹ Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 64-013-20250225

slopes, it would not to my mind result in a significant harmful effect on the visual openness of the Green Belt.

15. Nevertheless, it remains that the appeal scheme would result in substantial harm to the spatial aspect of the openness of the Green Belt.

Other Considerations and Very Special Circumstances

16. The appeal scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 153 of the Framework advises that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. It also indicates that inappropriate development is by definition harmful and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances. These will not exist unless potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
17. The appellant indicates that the appeal scheme is needed to provide their family with a modern family home. However, the appellant has not adequately demonstrated the need for the additional first storey and why the existing bungalow would not be adequate.
18. Regarding the approval for development at 265 Hithermoor Road, I do not have the full circumstances before me and therefore cannot be certain that it is wholly comparable to the appeal scheme before me. Nevertheless, each case is determined on its own merits and given the site-specific planning history and proposed scale of the appeal scheme, it does not lead me to a different conclusion.
19. In conclusion, the appellant has not adequately demonstrated that the very special circumstances necessary to justify the appeal scheme exist.

Conclusion

20. 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 above the appeal should be dismissed.

B Astley-Serougi

INSPECTOR