
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/25/3366663

East Keffolds, Bunch Lane, Haslemere, Surrey GU27 1AJ

- 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 Evan Reynolds against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is WA/2025/00353.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'internal and external works to single-storey extension. Construction of new garage.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'erection of a single storey extension and alterations; erection of a detached garage' at East Keffolds, Bunch Lane, Haslemere, Surrey GU27 1AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2025/00353, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, the appellant indicates on the appeal form that the description was changed to 'erection of a single storey extension and alterations; erection of a detached garage' which is how the proposal is described on the Council's decision notice. As this description has been used by both main parties and I consider it a more accurate description of the development as shown on the submitted plans, I am satisfied that no party would be unfairly prejudiced by my assessment of the appeal on the basis of the amended description and I have also used this description in my formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes one of three dwellings that have been created within a large house accessed from Bunch Lane. To the side of the dwelling is an area of hardstanding used for parking, beyond which is a grassed garden which wraps around to the rear of the dwelling and which includes a single-storey outbuilding set some way from the building.
5. The appeal site is within the Green Belt where the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') states that inappropriate development is, by

definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Policy RE2 of the Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 ('the LPP1') further indicates that Green Belt will be protected against inappropriate development, but that proposals will be permitted where they do not conflict with the exceptions listed in national planning policy.

6. In this respect, the Framework provides that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt, but with some specified exceptions. These include 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. From the information before me, I agree with the Council that the single-storey extension to the side of the dwelling would fall within this exception.
7. The proposal also includes a detached garage which would sit behind the hardstanding currently used for parking. The Council considers that the garage would not fall within any of the exceptions specified in the Framework. However, the appellant refers to the exception at paragraph 154 g) of the Framework relating to limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
8. The definition of previously developed land within the Framework refers to 'land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land'. I have no firm reason to consider the appeal dwelling was not lawfully developed. It is clearly a permanent structure, and from my observations of the site and the information before me, I am satisfied that the garage would be positioned within the garden which forms part of the curtilage of the developed land. Furthermore, the Framework excludes land in built-up areas such as residential gardens from the definition of previously developed land, but other development in the vicinity of the appeal site is very limited and buildings are set within extensive areas of woodland and other open land. In my view, the site would not therefore be part of a built up area.
9. Given these factors, I find that the garage could reasonably be described as infilling or redevelopment of previously developed land. In accordance with the Framework, it may therefore comprise an exception to inappropriate development if it would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
10. In spatial terms, the garage would introduce built form to an undeveloped part of the site where its presence would inevitably result in a loss of openness. The Council also notes that the garage would be located some 12.4m from the dwelling which it argues would result in significant built form radiating outwards from Keffolds. However, the garage would be of comparatively modest width and depth and single storey height, with a Dutch hip roof design that would reduce the bulk and mass of the upper part of the building helping to moderate effects on openness. Given also that it would be positioned between the appeal dwelling and an existing outbuilding towards the end of the garden, it would not meaningfully increase the maximum extent of the spread of development across the site. Furthermore, the nature of the proposal as a residential outbuilding means that it would not generate significant additional activity or traffic.
11. In visual terms, the appeal site occupies an elevated position. However, a wooded bank rises to the north west of the garage. Together with the surrounding

topography and siting of the garage relative to Keffolds, this would significantly restrict any opportunities for views of the garage from much of the surrounding area outside of the appeal site, including from Bunch Lane. Some views could be possible from the south east where land levels fall away from the site, but these would be long distance views which would help to reduce any visual impact of development. In addition, there is significant tree cover close to the site and even when not in full leaf, I saw that the density of vegetation provides notable screening so that any views would be likely to be limited to glimpses. Moreover, where glimpses of the garage were possible, it would be appreciated as a clearly subordinate structure to the host building, sitting within the existing residential envelope. It would not therefore be obtrusive within the landscape and these factors in combination mean that I consider that any visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be very limited.

12. Given these factors, the garage would cause some harm to Green Belt openness, but I find that the overall degree of harm would be moderate at worst and certainly not substantial. Notwithstanding that it may be larger than a carport that was approved to South Keffolds and the Council's comments querying the requirement for the space proposed, I find on that basis that the garage would also be an exception to inappropriate development under the terms of the Framework.
13. In reaching this view, I note the Council's concerns that the garage roof could be converted to habitable accommodation, increasing the residential intensity of the site which I agree could result in additional harm to openness. The appellant suggests that the site would still be occupied by the same number of residents as at present, but additional accommodation could conceivably enable increased occupation of the site. Nevertheless, a condition suggested by the appellant to restrict the use of the garage would offer a suitable control to enable the effect of any future changes that might alter the assessment of whether or not the proposal would meet the Framework exception to be considered.
14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would comprise an exception to inappropriate development within the Green Belt. It would accordingly comply with the Framework and Policy RE2 of the LPP1.
15. Furthermore, I note that the supporting text to Policy DM14 of the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2023 indicates that new domestic garages and other ancillary outbuildings requiring express planning permission are generally inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they fall within one of the categories of not inappropriate development set out in the Framework. The garage would not be one of the types of development that Policy DM14 specifies particular criteria for, but having found that it would comprise an exception to inappropriate development within the Green Belt, I do not identify conflict with this policy.
16. As an exception to inappropriate development within the Green Belt, the proposal should further not be regarded as harmful to the purposes of Green Belt, and footnote 55 of the Framework confirms that the proposal would be excluded from the requirement to give substantial weight to any harm to the Green Belt, including to its openness.

Other Matters

17. Keffolds, which the appeal dwelling is part of, is a Grade II listed building. In accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the LBCA'), I have therefore had special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
18. The list entry notes that Keffolds was built in 1905 by local architect and builder Herbert Hutchinson. The building is of Jacobethan style with attractive details including partial timber framing, red brick with diaper work, and hanging tiles; and has an L-shaped plan with principal rooms to the south west and a service wing to the north east. It sits within gardens set amongst surrounding woodland, positioned on the hillside to take advantage of extensive countryside views.
19. The appeal dwelling is part of the former service wing and is accessed via an entrance within a single storey projection which the Council indicates was formerly outhouses accessed by an open passageway with screen wall. The single-storey part of the building has been much altered so that little of the historic function or character remain, and I saw that it is now in poor condition.
20. Insofar as it relates to this appeal, I consider Keffolds to derive special interest from its historic and architectural interest as an artistic house in the countryside. The grounds which provide the immediate setting around the house contribute to its sense of status and seclusion and thus the significance of the listed building.
21. Although the proposal would see significant alterations to the dwelling's single-storey projection, the Council's conservation officer notes that these would not be harmful given the previous changes and that archived original plans survive. They also consider that the proposed extension would be architecturally harmonious and would provide a more effective termination to the garden front of the listed building. I have no firm reason to take a different view. The proposed garage would be within the setting of the listed building, but its traditional form and appearance would be sympathetic to the host building, and it would not be an unexpected or incongruous feature within grounds to a building of this scale.
22. Given these factors, I agree with the Council that the special interest and significance of the listed building would be preserved.
23. The appeal site is also located within the Surrey Hills National Landscape ('the NL') where section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended) outlines a duty to seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the NL. Insofar as the extension and garage would be sympathetic to the host dwelling, would sit within an existing residential site and the limited opportunities for views from the surrounding area such that any visual impact would additionally be very limited, I agree with the Council that there would not be detriment to the character of the area and I am satisfied that the natural beauty of the NL would be conserved.
24. I note that the garage would be positioned within a 15m buffer to an area of designated ancient semi-natural woodland which would be contrary to standing advice provided by Natural England and the Forestry Commission. However, it would be within an existing residential garden, and while there would be an additional building, there would be no material change of use of the site. Noting

also the nature of the building as garage and storage, and subject to a condition restricting its usage as discussed above, there would be no meaningful intensification of activity or the use of the site. The relationship of the garage with the woodland and conditions of the intervening land additionally means that there would be unlikely to be undue safety concerns or pressure for management of the woodland canopy. Furthermore, while there would be potential for disruption or damage during construction, protection measures could be secured through planning conditions. With such measures, the Council is satisfied that development could be carried out without harming the ancient woodland and having regard to the particular circumstances in this case, I see no firm reason to take a different view. On that basis, the proposal would not result in loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats.

Conditions

25. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of certainty. To safeguard the listed building and character and appearance of the area, I have imposed conditions suggested by the Council's conservation officer to require details of external materials and finishes and windows and doors, and to specify details of the garage roof.
26. Conditions are necessary to ensure suitable protection for nearby trees. I have however amended the conditions suggested by the Council's Arboricultural officer in the interests of clarity and certainty; imposing one condition requiring that details of supervision are submitted and approved alongside the implementation of protection measures, and a separate condition relating to retained trees. Although not suggested by the Council, I consider an additional condition requiring details of how woodland specifically would be protected during construction is necessary given that potential effects could occur through means other than direct impacts that might be mitigated by provision of fencing and exclusion zones to protect individual trees and root protection zones. The conditions relating to protection measures and supervision are pre commencement conditions as it is necessary to ensure that measures are in place throughout the construction process, and the appellant has indicated that they would agree to these conditions.
27. Finally, I have imposed a condition relating to the use of the garage in the interests of safeguarding woodland and the Green Belt for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

28. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would accord with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Unless otherwise amended under the conditions below, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SDA013-100.1LP Rev P5, SDA013-100.2 B Rev P5, SDA013-101 Rev P1, SDA013-102 Rev P1, SDA013-103 Rev P1, SDA013-104 Rev P1, SDA013-105 Rev P1, SDA013-106 Rev P1, SDA013-107 Rev P1, SDA013-108 Rev P1, SDA013-109 Rev P1, SDA013-110 Rev P1, SDA013-111 Rev P1, SDA013-112 Rev P1, SDA013-113 Rev P1, SDA013-114 Rev P1, SDA013-115 Rev P1, SDA013-116 Rev P1, SDA013-117 Rev P, BJH 01/02 and BJH 03/04.
- 3) No development shall take place until tree protection measures have been installed in accordance with the submitted arboricultural information and a scheme of verification and supervision for the arboricultural protection measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of supervision and verification shall be implemented as approved and the tree protection measures shall be retained until all construction has finished and equipment, materials, and machinery are removed from the site.
- 4) No development shall take place until a woodland protection plan including details of development and construction methods to minimise the impact of works and safeguard woodland including in relation to pollution, disturbance and root damage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The protection plan shall be implemented as approved until all construction has finished and equipment, materials, and machinery are removed from the site.
- 5) No development above proposed ground level shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development 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 and samples.
- 6) Before the relevant work begins, drawings at a scale of not smaller than 1:5 detailing new windows and external doors shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drawings shall include details of the materials; decorative/protective finishes; cross sections of the frame, transom, mullions and glazing bars; and method of opening. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 7) The roof of the garage hereby permitted shall be constructed with open eaves (rafter feet showing), hog's back ridge tiles and bonnet hips.
- 8) For a period of 5 years from the first occupation of the development hereby permitted:
 - a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be pruned other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any pruning shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (tree

work) (or equivalent if replaced) and in accordance with any supplied arboricultural method statement.

- b) if any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

‘Retained tree’ in this condition means an existing tree, which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars.

- 9) The garage hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used at any time other than for garaging and/or storage purposes incidental to the residential use of the dwelling known as East Keffolds and shall not be used for any habitable or primary residential accommodation.

End of Schedule