
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2026

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/25/3375879

Greenfields, 110 Glaziers Lane, Normandy, Surrey GU3 2DQ

- 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 Elliott against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/00651.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension following demolition of the conservatory. Porch infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal 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 proposal on the openness of the Green Belt, and;
 - 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

Inappropriate development

3. The appeal site is within the Green Belt which Policy P2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan Strategy and Sites (2019) (the Local Plan) seeks to protect against inappropriate development in accordance with the Framework. Policy P2 of the Local Plan sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt will constitute inappropriate development, unless the buildings fall within the list of exceptions identified by the Framework.
4. The Framework outlines several exceptions to inappropriate development at paragraphs 154 and 155. Within these exceptions there is an allowance under paragraph 154 c) that the extension or alteration of a building would not be inappropriate development, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

5. The existing building has already been extended through the existing rear conservatory. Although the proposal seeks partly to replace this conservatory in a broadly similar position, rather than being a similar scale, the overall footprint of the rear extension would be larger in both width and depth.
6. The Framework refers to the size of the original buildings and is not prescriptive as to how proportionality is assessed (i.e. it does not set out that the test is based on footprint, nor does it provide numerical thresholds). Although the increase compared to the existing building would be modest, the policy test is clear that the assessment relates to the original building. When compared to the original building, the proposal would represent an approximate 83% increase in floorspace.
7. Despite the single storey height of the proposal, I find that taken as a whole, the proposal would represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. It would therefore fail to satisfy the exception to inappropriate development set out through paragraph 154 c) of the Framework and would be contrary to Policy P2 of the Local Plan.

Openness

8. Paragraph 142 of the Framework outlines that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Openness can have both spatial and visual aspects.
9. Most of the proposal would be to the rear of the dwelling, extending the footprint and leading to a greater proportion of the appeal site being occupied by built form. Visually, whilst the proposal would not increase the overall height of the dwelling, it would add to its massing through the increased rear projection.
10. Noting that the extensions would be self-contained within the curtilage of the existing dwelling, I consider that the effects on both the spatial and visual openness of the Green Belt would be limited. Nevertheless, the proposal would erode the openness of the Green Belt, which is one of its essential characteristics. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not preserve and therefore would have a harmful effect on the openness of the Green Belt. This carries substantial weight as per paragraph 153 of the Framework.

Other considerations

11. The planning statement submitted to support the application made brief references to options to extend the dwelling through either permitted development rights or prior approval for larger extensions. Nevertheless, precise details have not been provided. I therefore cannot be satisfied that the extension of the dwelling through permitted development would be a plausible fall-back option, or that if it would, it would be more harmful in Green Belt terms. I have therefore given reference to these options very limited weight.
12. It is presented that several neighbouring properties have been extended including the attached neighbour. However, I have very little evidence before me as to the context of these extensions (including their comparative scale to the original building), or their status regarding planning permission. I therefore cannot be satisfied that they are directly comparable to the appeal proposal to a degree that

they would justifying me altering my overall conclusions. Again, I have given this other consideration very limited weight.

13. I understand that land to the northwest is subject to consultation for further development. Notwithstanding that this does not appear to have planning permission, the considerations around the development of up to 950 dwellings would be entirely different to an application to extend an existing building.
14. It is suggested that the existing conservatory is no longer fit for purpose and that the proposal would better re-configure the dwelling to allow the creation of an additional bedroom. Whilst this would represent a benefit to the appellant, it does not represent a unique circumstance and therefore I have attached it limited weight.

Green Belt Balance

15. The proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would also cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. I attach substantial weight to the associated Green Belt harm. The Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
16. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Taken together, the other considerations put forward carry at most limited weight. It follows that the substantial weight to be given to Green Belt harm is not clearly outweighed by other considerations in this case. Therefore, the very special circumstances required to justify the proposed development do not exist. The proposed development would not accord with the Green Belt aims of Policy P2 of the Local Plan or the Framework.

Other Matters

17. The Council did not resist the proposal on matters of design, neighbouring living conditions or sustainability. I note the intention for the proposal to use materials to match the existing dwelling. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to reach a different judgement in respect of these matters. Nevertheless, a lack of harm in these respects does not specifically weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR