



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2024

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2024

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/W/24/3347537**

**53 Tekels Avenue, Camberley, Surrey GU15 2LB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Robin Roopun against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/0185/PMR.
  - The application sought planning permission for the erection of a two storey front, side and rear extension, front porch with associated works without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 20/0632/FFU, dated 18/11/2020.
  - The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that: *The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: pec-01, pec-02, pec-08, pec-09, pec-10, pec-11, pec-12 and pec-13 unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.*
  - The reason given for the condition is: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.*
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Background and Main Issue

2. Planning application 20/0632/FFU granted permission for the erection of a two storey front, side and rear extension, front porch to the appeal property, a large detached property. I observed that initial works had begun on site.
3. The application was submitted under S73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (The Act) to vary condition 3 of the original planning permission by substituting a different set of plans to those approved.
4. The proposal seeks to amend the approved plans to allow for a change in the internal layout, and externally, reduce the balcony and porch to the front elevation, provide three additional rear roof lights, a roof lantern, remove the chimneys and amend the fenestration at ground floor level. In addition, it is proposed to erect a flat roofed, two storey rear extension. This would have a recessed balcony at first floor level. The maximum height of the whole building would increase by 0.2 metres.
5. The main issue is the effect of the amendments on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

## Reasons

6. The appeal property is a substantial two storey (with additional accommodation in the roof space) dwelling located on a lengthy residential street characterised by similarly large, detached dwellings in large plots.
7. The appeal dwelling is located within the Wooded Hills Housing Character Area, as identified in the Supplementary Planning Document Western Urban Area Character (2012) (WUA). The WUA sets out that the character of the wider area is complex and mixed, with the Wooded Hills Housing Character Area characterized by large, low density, wooded plots and consist principally of 2 storey dwellings.
8. The approved extensions under permission 20/0632/FFU would result in a balanced and coherent hipped roofed property with front and rear gables. The consistency in the roof form when viewed from the front and rear contributes positively to its harmonious character.
9. The proposed changes in the internal layout, and externally, in relation to the balcony, porch, three additional rear roof lights, roof lantern, removal of the chimneys and amendment to the fenestration at ground floor have previously been granted permission under application 23/1176/PMR. The Council indicate that these alterations have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. From what has been submitted and what I have observed, I have no reason to disagree.
10. Given the scale of property as approved by application 20/0632/FFU, the size of the additions would not result in the property appearing disproportionate or out of place in the surrounding context, where, whilst mostly 2 storeys, I observed that there are dwellings of varying heights and substantial scale.
11. However, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Design Guide' (2017) sets out that flat roofed sections are unacceptable as roof alterations should be sympathetic and subservient to the design of the main building.
12. The introduction of a substantial flat roofed element to the rear, extending the width of the property at first floor level, would appear at odds with the surrounding hipped roof forms of the property. It would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition when viewed from either side elevation and would unbalance the rear elevation. The replication of the approved elevational treatment and a parapet design would not mitigate for the visual impact of the form of the unsympathetic addition, which would detract from the existing coherent design and character of the dwelling. Similarly, projecting balconies are, by virtue of their minor scale and height, limited in their visual impact. As such, these balconies being recessed is not a benefit that outweighs the visual impact of the two storey full width extension.
13. Whilst I observed that whilst the rear of the property is not visible from the highway or adjacent footpath, it would be visible from the neighbouring property. As such, the amended scheme would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding street scene. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012) which requires development to achieve high quality design.

**Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*B Phillips*

INSPECTOR