
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by **A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/D/25/3372872

8 Chipperfield Road, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire WD4 9JA

- 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 A Kariya against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01145/FHA.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed development seeks two separate extensions. On this basis, I have used the development description on the Decision Notice as it is a more accurate reflection of the development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (Framework) and relevant development plan policies.
 - The effect of the proposal on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt.
 - Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Is the proposal inappropriate development?

4. The property is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The current building is a two storey detached dwelling. To the rear of the site is a field and on the opposite side of Chipperfield Road what appeared to be allotments.
5. Paragraph 153 of the Framework requires that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including its openness. It goes on to state 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances'.

6. Paragraph 154 of the Framework defines that development is inappropriate development unless 'it 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'.
7. It is noted that the original dwelling has had significant extensions added to it over the past approximately 25 years. From the evidence in from of me, the Council state the proposed development leading to an increase in 71% in floorspace and 61% increase in volume from the original dwelling. The appellant has not provided alternative figures for this evidence.
8. From the evidence before me the Council's Core Strategy Adopted 25 September 2013 (Core Strategy), specifically Policy CS5 states only limited extensions to existing buildings, though does not provide any specific limitations on how much a dwelling can be extended within the Green Belt. However, as stated above the original dwelling has already been significantly extended. Therefore, the increase in both additional proposed volume and floorspace would be an overall disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.
9. I have noted the various appeal decisions provided by the appellant which assessed whether extensions are disproportionate. However, it is not possible to provide direct comparisons regarding percentage increases on other sites as context differs. Therefore, I have considered the proposal on its own merits.
10. On this basis the proposed extension, by virtue of its size is inappropriate development within the Green Belt and causes substantial harm. Therefore, the proposal would not comply with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy that only allows limited extensions to existing buildings within the Green Belt.

Openness and purposes of the Green Belt

11. The proposal seeks to provide two single storey extensions to the rear of the existing dwelling. These extensions would not be easily visible from any public space.
12. Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy states that the Green Belt is to protect the openness and character of the Green Belt, physical separation of settlements and local distinctiveness.
13. With the proposal contained within the existing residential plot, the proposal would not cause any additional harm regarding loss of physical separation between settlements or local distinctiveness.
14. The proposed extensions by virtue of their size and location would not lead to any harm to the openness of the wider Green Belt. On this basis the proposal would have no harm upon the wider openness and purposes of the Green Belt. Therefore, there is no additional harm to Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy.

Do other considerations amount to Very Special Circumstances?

15. With the proposal being inappropriate development it should only be allowed if there is a very special circumstance as detailed under paragraph 153 of the Framework.

16. The appellant has provided documents for planning reference 4/00993/19/FHA for extensions at 20 Chipperfield Road. However, while a copy of the decision notice by Dacorum Borough Council has been provided a copy of the Delegated/Committee Report has not been. In addition, from the evidence provided the proposal was seeking a 49% increase in floorspace, though it is noted that this could be a greater percentage over the original dwelling. While each application is determined on its own merits and based on the context provided, this relatively recent and near approved development holds limited weight in favour of the proposal as it adds significantly less floorspace to the dwelling.
17. The appellant has also provided documents for a development at 26 Chipperfield Road. However, no decision notice or relevant report has been provided. In addition, from the evidence provided it is stated that the area demolished is greater than the area proposed, primarily through the demolition of a pool building in the rear garden. Based upon the context that a larger area of built form is being removed within the Green Belt, this is a neutral factor in my determination.
18. It is noted that the site is in a line of relatively large, detached dwellings. However, this does not change the fact that the proposal is within the Green Belt. This is a neutral factor in my determination.
19. High quality design is the minimum standard set under paragraph 131 of the Framework. The proposal being of a sympathetic style to the existing dwelling is therefore a neutral factor in my determination. In addition, the submitted existing floor plan shows that the proposal can already be used as a family home. On this basis, the enlargement of the living space is also a neutral factor.
20. The proposal would have some short-term economic benefits during the construction phase. This holds limited weight in favour of the proposal.
21. The other considerations do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and therefore do not form very special circumstances. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be a disproportionate extension in the Green Belt and there are no very special circumstances to justify allowing this development. On this basis, the proposal does not accord with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy that states the Council will determine in accordance with national policy and will allow limited extensions to existing buildings. The proposal also does not accord with chapter 13 of the Framework, specifically paragraphs 153 and 154, as detailed above.

Other Matters

22. I have had regard to the duties contained in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. A small proportion of the site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area. Given the location and scale of the proposed development, as well its distance from the Conservation Area, the proposal would have a neutral impact upon this designated heritage asset. On this basis, the proposal accords with chapter 16 of the Framework.
23. I have been provided with a copy of Kings Langley Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2038, adopted January 2023 (Neighbourhood Plan). However, I have not been directed to any specific part of this Neighbourhood Plan. This plan has been a neutral factor in my determination.

Conclusion

24. 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.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR