



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/25/3368479

2 Brunswick Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6RS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Jutla against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Reference is 25/0355/FFU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is semi-detached two storey home built in the 1950s and lying at the southern entrance to Deepcut village. It has subtle well-designed proportions and elevations which broadly match the attached home. Mature trees are important features in the front garden. With recent local development the area has become one of largely suburban residential character and the appeal property and its immediate and wider neighbouring dwellings sit comfortably within the pleasing appearance of the locality. The proposal is as described above. It would effectively be a widening of the front gable towards the neighbouring dwelling with upper alterations to form a crown roof.
 4. The Appellants' understandably make the case that front garden trees would lead to partial screening, matching materials would be carefully selected, and whilst there would be some disruption to symmetry main features would allow the pairing to continue to read comfortably together. Unfortunately, whilst appreciating the mitigation, I cannot agree that this scheme would represent design which should be endorsed. The alterations to the front elevation would be excessive, visually awkward, dominant and unbalancing. The building would end up appearing rather contrived, asymmetrical and ungainly.
 5. Added to this, to my mind the subtle and harmonious roofs of the pair of properties are a key feature which presently contributes positively to the aesthetic quality of the area. Unfortunately, the crown roof of the scheme
-

before me would not sit comfortably in this context. Even with the use of matching roof finishes the bulky crown would look misplaced and be jarring on the eye.

6. Notwithstanding trees, the position here has a degree of prominence and there would be impact on the streetscene as well as on the architectural qualities of the house itself. In summary the overall design proposed and scale of change is not suited to the character or appearance of this dwelling or its context.
7. Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (DM) seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that new development has high quality design, suitable massing and scale, and is protective of the character and appearance of its context. This is reflected within principles of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), albeit this is a document which cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with the DM policy and the relevant objectives of the SPD.

Other matters

8. I do understand the wish to extend this property and I hope that a satisfactory solution can be found. I have considered '18 Highbury Crescent' drawn to my attention but found the site, the scheme's design and the nature of the street to be very different from the case in hand. In any event I must determine this proposal on its own merits. I am aware of the appeal property's planning history and the fact that a side extension has been allowed (ref 15/0552). The Appellants' point is that this, had it been built, would have disrupted the symmetry of the semi-detached pair, and thus demonstrates that the Council does not see this matter as sacrosanct. From my perspective, yes it would have altered the visual balance, but given design and positioning, not comparable to the adverse significance of the appeal scheme.
9. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellants but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR