



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2026

**by E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 09 March 2026**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/25/3376011**

**Holly Cottage, Fulmer Common Road, Fulmer, Buckinghamshire SL3 6JN**

- 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 J Pelton against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - South Area (South Bucks).
  - The application Ref is PL/25/2141/FA.
  - The development proposed is a single storey porch and lean-to roof addition, changes to fenestration and application of black stained timber boarding.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey porch and lean-to roof addition, changes to fenestration and application of black stained timber boarding at Holly Cottage, Fulmer Common Road, Fulmer, Buckinghamshire, SL3 6JN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/25/2141/FA, 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 Dwg. No. 9 – Location and Site Plans and Dwg. No. 8 – Open Porch extension.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out using the materials shown on the approved plans.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue 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

3. The appeal property is a detached 2 storey dwelling on a generous plot within the Green Belt. The appeal proposal includes an open sided tiled lean-to roof and porch, supported by timber posts, to the flank elevation of the property, together with new windows and the addition of black stained timber boarding to the upper section of part of the building. The Council's main concern is the proposed addition of the lean-to and porch.
4. The Framework is clear that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It sets out that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it meets one

of the exceptions listed, which 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. The Framework does not provide a definition of disproportionate additions, therefore an assessment of whether a proposal would amount to a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building is a matter of planning judgement.

5. Policy GB1 of the South Bucks District Local Plan 1999 (the LP) outlines that within the Green Belt, planning permission will not be granted for development other than in the specific circumstances listed, one of which is (e) the limited extension of existing dwellings, in accordance with Policies GB10 and GB11 of the LP. Policy GB10 sets out that extensions to existing dwellings in the Green Belt will normally be permitted provided that a range of criteria are met, including that (b) the extension together with any earlier extensions, would be of a small scale, in relation to the size of the original dwelling. While the supporting text indicates that extensions or alterations which would result in the original dwelling having increased its floorspace by more than half will not be regarded as small scale, this does not form part of the adopted policy.
6. Policies GB1 and GB10 are generally consistent with the aims of the Framework, in that they resist inappropriate development, and allow the limited extension of existing dwellings. However, the test in the Framework is whether the extension would be a disproportionate addition, rather than whether it would be small scale. I therefore attribute greater weight to the Framework in this case.
7. The Council contend that, as the appeal property has been extended previously, the proposed lean-to and porch, in addition to previous extensions, would result in just under a 60% increase over and above the size of the original building. This is not disputed by the appellant. The proposal would add further to the size of the dwelling, nonetheless, the addition is modest in terms of footprint, built form and overall volume. Consequently, the increase in the overall mass of the building would not be substantial. In addition, by virtue of its height, which would be lower than that of the main dwelling, it would be visually subservient to the host property. It would also be sympathetic in design terms and would not occupy an unduly conspicuous position in the street scene or the wider landscape.
8. Therefore, having regard to the increase in floorspace, as well as the overall scale and volume of the proposed extension, the cumulative increase in size of the dwelling by virtue of the proposal, together with the previous extensions, would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Nor would the proposal conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.
9. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt as defined in the Framework. Accordingly, the proposals would not conflict with Policies GB1 and GB10 of the LP. Since I have concluded the proposal would not be inappropriate development, it is not necessary to consider the effect on the openness of the Green Belt or the application of very special circumstances.

## **Conditions**

10. Standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans are necessary to provide certainty. I have also imposed a

condition to require the materials to be used as shown on the submitted drawings, in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

**Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

*E Worley*

INSPECTOR