



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/25/3373660

29 Minehurst Road, Mytchett, SURREY GU16 6JP

- 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 Stewart Edgar against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0720/FFU.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor side extension on top of existing single storey side extension along with the construction of a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area and on an Oak tree that is protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The area is characterised by two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings which share a similar original design and appearance to that of the appeal property. This part of the estate is made up of a small mix of repeating house designs which provide the area with a visually pleasing coherence that gives the locality a distinctive sense of place.
4. The design of the two-storey extension would differ from the main building with regards to its form, fenestration and external materials. The asymmetrical roof form of the two storey extension would have lower eaves at the rear of the building. The largely blank side elevation and high level window to the front elevation would not be in keeping with the arrangement of the original dwelling and vertical cladding would be applied to the rear elevation. Being out of keeping with the design of the host dwelling the extension would appear as an unsympathetic addition to the dwelling and would detract from both it and the cohesive character and appearance of the area.
5. The extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling. Nonetheless, although being located at the terminus of Minehurst Road, the visual harm arising from this part of the proposed development would be visible in public

views gained from Minehurst Road, the public park to the side of the appeal property and in the outlook of those existing residents at the end of the cul-de-sac.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document, Principles 10.1, 10.3 and 10.5 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), PO3 of the Western Urban Area Character SPD and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy DM9 seeks, amongst other matters, development to be of high quality design. In addition, the extension would not be of a form, architectural style or reflect the materials of the original building, as required by the Residential Design Guide SPD. Furthermore, the proposal would visually harm the post war architecture of the host building that Guiding Principle PO3 of the Western Urban Area Character SPD specifically seeks to prevent.

TPO tree

7. The proposed development would bring built development into close proximity to an existing oak tree. This mature tree is an attractive feature within the street scene and is of high visual amenity value for this reason. The TPO that is in place affords this tree protection. This makes it all the more important to protect the oak tree from harm to ensure its longevity is not undermined. The premature loss of this tree would have a significant and negative visual impact on the street scene.
8. The planning application was supported by an Arboricultural Survey and tree constraints plan. However, this does not provide an evaluation of the impact of the proposed development on the tree and its roots. The appellant contends that a detailed Tree Survey Report has been undertaken and whilst the report identifies that a proportion of the proposed extension would fall within the tree's root protection zone, the arboriculturalist has concluded that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the health of the tree. However, the Officer delegated report indicates that an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, as requested by the Council's Arboricultural Officer, were not forthcoming during the course of the consideration of the planning application. Whilst it is suggested that the use of reinforced concrete slab suspended on mini pile foundations could be utilised, there is no indication this foundation method would be acceptable to the Council.
9. As such, I cannot be certain that the oak tree would not be harmed as a result of the proposed development and/or that its long-term protection would be sufficiently secured. The proposed development, therefore, has a significant potential to negatively impact upon the tree and have a detrimental impact on its wellbeing in the long-term that could lead to pressure to remove the tree in the future. This would be an erosion of the statutory protection placed upon the tree by the serving of the TPO. As a consequence, the proposal should be resisted.
10. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. That policy seeks, amongst other matters, the protection of trees and vegetation.

Other Matters

11. I note there is neighbour support for the proposed development. Nonetheless, this does not overcome my above concerns or justify the granting of planning permission in this case.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR