



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2025

by J Heppell BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/25/3374021

Hazel Cottage, Hale House Lane, Churt, Surrey GU10 2JQ

- 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 Mrs C Pierson against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is WA/2025/01036.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front extension at Hazel Cottage, Hale House Lane, Churt, Surrey GU10 2JQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2025/01036, 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 25/452/01 (Proposed Site & Location Plan), 24/452/04 (Proposed Ground and Roof Plans) and 24/452/05 (Proposed Elevations).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matter

2. As the proposal is for an extension, I have adjusted the description of development to refer to extension in the singular.

Main Issue

3. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - whether the 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;
 - if inappropriate, the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt; and
 - if inappropriate, whether the 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

4. The proposal is to extend the dwelling. Paragraph 154 of the Framework advises that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the listed exceptions applies. One of these, criterion (c), allows 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' and so this is a matter of planning judgement.
5. Policy RE2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites February 2018 (LPP1) and Policy DM14 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies March 2023 (LPP2) are broadly consistent with the Framework in this regard. Policy DM14 indicates that changes in scale, mass, height and floorspace contribute to the assessment of what constitutes 'disproportionate'. As the assessment in the Framework is one of size (and not just floorspace), these criteria would also be consistent with the Framework.
6. The supporting text to Policy DM14 explains that, where a building is outside of but visually well related to a settlement boundary, a decision will be made on a case-by-case basis whether to apply the Policy's 40% floorspace limit on extensions, as well as the 'visual test' set out above. The appeal site and its neighbour to the north lie outside of but abutting the settlement boundary of Churt, which was most recently reviewed in 2023.
7. The appeal site faces open countryside and is accessed off Hale House Road, which has some of the characteristics of a country lane. It is screened from the houses at the rear, which lie within the settlement boundary and are accessed from The Meadows, a residential cul-de-sac with somewhat smaller plots than the appeal site. Nonetheless, the appeal site is visually well-related to the settlement boundary, and is within the built-up portion of Churt as delineated by Hale House Lane. In accordance with the supporting text, therefore, I find the percentage requirement of Policy DM14 does not need to be applied in this instance.
8. The proposed single storey extension would project forward from part of the front elevation of the dwelling by a modest amount. It would be visually subservient to the existing front gable and would be seen against the backdrop of the existing dwelling. The house has previously been extended at both ends, which has not resulted in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling. The proposed extension, in combination with the previous extensions, would not alter this situation. Taking all of these factors into account, the proposal would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and would accord with Policy RE2 of the LPP1 and Policy DM14 of the LPP2, which together seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. It would therefore not be harmful either to the openness of the Green Belt or to the purposes of including land within it.
10. Although the appellant referred to paragraph 154(e) of the Framework, I have found the proposal to accord with paragraph 154(c), and it is not therefore necessary to consider the proposal under paragraph 154(e) as it would not alter my overall conclusion on paragraph 154(c). Given my finding on this main issue,

there is no requirement to assess if there are other considerations that amount to very special circumstances so as to justify the development.

Conditions

11. In assessing the need for conditions, I have had regard to the policy requirements contained in the development plan and assessed the conditions in relation to the six tests set out in the Framework. It is necessary to impose a time limit condition and a condition listing the approved plans. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area, matching materials should be used.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the development would not conflict with the policies of the development plan. There are no material considerations which indicate a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

J Heppell

INSPECTOR