



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/25/3368720

Hurstwood Manor, 122A Upper Chobham Road, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1EJ

- 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 A Belnik against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0463/FFU.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and erection of lower ground, ground floor and first floor side and rear extension, and car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and erection of lower ground, ground floor and first floor side and rear extension, and car port at Hurstwood Manor, 122A Upper Chobham Road, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0463/FFU, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule of Conditions.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr A Belnik against Surrey Heath Borough Council and this is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling sited within a large, well landscaped plot. Levels across the site vary considerably with the rear of the site set at a much lower level than the site's frontage. Whilst from the front, the dwelling has the appearance of a two storey dwelling with an attached single storey garage, at the rear, the lower ground floor is fully exposed resulting in a three storey façade. Similarly, the existing garage side element is two storey in appearance when viewed from the rear with an undercroft garden storage area with a raised patio above projecting into the rear garden. The dwelling also benefits from roof accommodation, serving by roof lights on the front elevation and two dormer windows on the rear.
5. The site lies within the Wooded Hills Housing Character Area (WHHCA) as defined in the Council's Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document

2012 (Character SPD). The site is consistent with the key character features set out in the Character SPD which include dominantly substantial and detached houses, large, irregular plots, irregular building lines, well vegetated front, rear and side gardens, and dense and mature vegetation.

6. My attention has been drawn to a previous proposal on the site for a side extension, pool house and car port¹. This application was refused by the Council and dismissed on appeal². Amongst other matters, the Inspector was concerned about the erosion of space to the side of the dwelling and concluded that the proposal would fail to maintain the spacious and verdant qualities of the site and wider area.
7. The proposed extension would have the appearance of a part single / part two storey extension from the front, and a part two storey / part three storey extension to the rear due to the difference in levels and the exposure of the lower ground floor. Following the earlier appeal decision, my understanding is that the height of the extension has been reduced, and an increased distance provided to the side boundary. I agree with the Council's assessment that the proposal would maintain the spacious and verdant character of the area in this regard which is a key characteristic of the WHHCA.
8. Turning now to the design of the proposed extension, when viewed from the front of the site, including from the approach road leading from Upper Chobham Road, the main extension would appear as a two storey addition. The eaves height of the extension would match that of the host dwelling, but the ridge height would be significantly lower. The extension would incorporate a sunken crown roof with solar panels, in a similar manner to the roof form of the existing garage to be demolished. The flat roof area would be concealed by the proposed pitched roof around the extension such that it would not be perceivable when viewed from the front.
9. Furthermore, the main front elevation of the extension would be set back from the projecting front bays of the host dwelling and would replicate some of the more distinctive features of the existing dwelling. It would also be constructed in matching materials, with matching detailing and fenestration. The proposed extension would therefore reflect the character and design of the host dwelling and given its lower height and set back from the main front wall of the dwelling, would appear suitably subordinate as required by the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (Design SPD).
10. The proposed extension would be deep, extending beyond the main rear wall of the host dwelling by several metres. The extension would be a sizeable addition to the dwelling and would be appreciably more so when viewed from the side and rear due to the change in levels and the exposure of the lower ground floor. However, much of the extension would be read against the flank elevation of the host dwelling where due to its lower roof form, it would appear sufficiently subservient in terms of its height, scale and massing. The appearance of the extension would integrate well with the host dwelling in terms of its design features such as the proposed rear gable and the arrangement of window openings and associated detailing. Having regard to the scale and proportions of the host dwelling and the

¹ LPA ref. 24/0545/FFU

² Appeal Ref. APP/D3640/D/24/3353232

overall plot size, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not be disproportionately large or bulky in relation to the existing dwelling.

11. I acknowledge the Council's concerns regarding the crown roof design, which to an extent replicates the roof form of the existing garage to be demolished. Given the raised height of the extension and its increase in depth, the roof form would have the potential to be more visually prominent than that of the existing side garage. However, the crown roof would be set behind a pitched and hipped roof form and accordingly, would be well concealed and would not be particularly appreciable from outside of the site, where views of it would be largely limited to those from Carwarden House Community School rather than from public vantage points.
12. Furthermore, I do not agree that the lower eaves height on the rear section of the flank elevation would appear contrived, rather it would help to ensure that the extension is read as a subservient addition to the dwelling and would add interest and articulation to the design and appearance of the extension. Whilst the existing side gable would be higher than the proposed extension, this would not be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling or surrounding area. Whilst the roof of the proposed extension would not be integrated with the pitched roof of the existing house, I nevertheless find that it would be sympathetic to the design of the main building.
13. In conclusion I find that the proposed extension would be sufficiently well integrated with the host dwelling and would be subordinate in appearance. It would respect the scale, materials, and massing of the host dwelling and the spacious, well landscaped character of the plot would not be adversely affected by the proposal. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.
14. Therefore, the proposal would comply with Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2012) which seeks high quality design and for development to respect and enhance the local, natural or historic character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density. The proposal would also accord with the high quality design objectives set out in guiding principle WH6 of the Character SPD. Furthermore, there would be no conflict with Principle 10.1 of the Design SPD insofar as it advises that extensions will be expected to be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style and materials of the original building, or Principle 10.5 which advises that roof alterations should be sympathetic to the design of the main building.

Conditions

15. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

HWM-EL-01SS4 Rev 6

HWM-EL-03SS Rev 6

HWM-SPBP-EX Rev 6

HWM-00-SP2 Rev 06 proposed ground floor

HWM-00-SP2 Rev 06 proposed ground floor part

HWM-00-SP2 Rev 06 proposed driveway

HWM-01-SP Rev 6

HWM-02-SP Rev 6

HWM-03-SP Rev 6

HWM-BP Rev 6

HWM-BP-EX-OL Rev 6

HWM-EL-01 Rev 6

HWM-EL-01SS2 Rev 6

HWM-EL-01SS1 Rev 6

HWM-EL-01SS3 Rev 6

HWM-EL-01SS5 Rev 6

HWM-EL-01SS6 Rev 6

HWM-EL-02 Rev 6

HWM-EL-03 Rev 6

HWM-EL-04 Rev 6

HWM-EL-04SS Rev 06

HWM-LG-SP2 Rev 06

HWM-SITE Rev 06

HWM2-EL-05 Rev 06

End of Schedule