



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2025

by Jennifer Wallace BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 DECEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/25/3373923

31 Queens Road, Bisley, Woking, Surrey GU24 9AR

- 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 McClosky against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0764/FFU.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension following demolition of conservatory, two storey side extension following demolition of garage and render to external walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension following demolition of conservatory, two storey side extension following demolition of garage and render to external walls at 31 Queens Road, Bisley, Woking, Surrey GU24 9AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0764/FFU, 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 drawing nos Location Plan, 31QR_Block Plans B, 31QR_Proposed Elevations A and 31QR_Proposed Plans B.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

Whether Inappropriate Development

3. The site is located within the Green Belt. I have not been directed to any policies in the development plan, so I have assessed the proposal in accordance with government guidance contained in the Framework. This identifies at paragraph 142 that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by

keeping land permanently open. Paragraphs 154 and 155 of the Framework confirm that development is inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it is one of the exceptions listed.

4. Paragraph 154 c) of the Framework sets out one such exception is for 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. The Framework does not define 'disproportionate additions', however the glossary defines original building as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was originally built. The Council's officer report refers to 30% as being typically used by the Council to define proportionality but I have not been directed to any policy or supplementary planning document or guidance which refers to this.
5. There is dispute between the parties as to whether the existing garage should be considered part of the original dwelling. There is insufficient evidence before me to allow me to come to a conclusion on this so I have assessed the proposal on the basis that the garage is not part of the original dwelling. It is not in dispute that the conservatory to the rear is not part of the original dwelling. There is some dispute between the parties as to the precise extent of the increase in the floorspace of the property, however, it would be between 48% and 50%. This is a very minor difference, but I have assessed the proposal on the basis that the increase in floorspace is 50% and the increase in volume 57%.
6. Queens Road leads out of the built-up area of Bisley. The appeal site is a semi-detached property which is the last residential property in what is effectively ribbon development leading out of the settlement. The attached property at 33 Queens Road has been altered and extended. Both the appeal site and No.33 have outbuildings along the rear boundary. Adjacent to the appeal site appeared to involve a commercial use, with some dispersed paraphernalia visible on the site although the built form lay behind the appeal site. 27-29 Queens Road have been granted permission for two dwellings and this was underway at the time of my site visit.
7. The proposal would widen the existing property and extend it to the same height as the existing ridge in the two storey section. The single storey element would be to the rear of the property and full width. It would project for the same distance as the projection to the attached neighbour.
8. The proposal would be well related to the existing property and be of a clearly domestic scale and extent. It would be sited in a discrete location between the existing dwellings and that currently under construction. The additional mass associated additional floorspace and volume, while notable, would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.
9. I therefore conclude the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would be in accordance with the exemption set out in paragraph 154c) of the Framework.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested several conditions should the appeal be allowed. I have had regard to these in light of the advice contained within paragraph 57 of the Framework. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the

commencement of development and approved plans to define the terms of the permission.

11. The description of development on the application form indicated it was intended to render the property. It therefore would not be reasonable to impose a condition requiring the materials to match the existing dwelling as suggested by the Council. However, it is necessary to control the materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, requiring details of materials to be agreed is reasonable and necessary.
12. The Council also suggested a condition be imposed requiring the first-floor ensuite window to be non-opening and obscure glazed. In planning terms, this window would not result in a new relationship of overlooking to the neighbouring properties, including that under construction at the time of my site visit. The condition therefore fails the test of necessity.

Conclusion

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

Jennifer Wallace

INSPECTOR