



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by **N Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/25/3375845

Sunnymede, New England Hill, West End, Woking, Surrey GU24 9PY

- 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 Robin Shaw against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0548/FFU.
 - The development proposed is to extend an existing loft conversion and add a new rear facing ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and area, and, whether the proposed development would have an adverse effect on protected species.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site comprises a single storey bungalow constructed in brick and partly rendered with tile hanging and is set under a tiled roof. The proposal seeks to alter and extend the property including by enlarging the roof to create a large, flat roofed upper floor extension.
4. This upper floor extension has limited regard for the style and form of the existing dwelling. It would cut through the ridge lines including forming breaks in the roof slope to form windows, cross the line of the eaves and exceed the height of the existing dwelling. It would appear as an unsympathetic addition to the property. The proposal is of limited design merit and its adverse effect on the character of the property would be compounded due to its visibility from passing walking routes around the site.
5. I accept the existing house does feature a mix of styles and forms, but this is a part of its character and it is not a jarring feature in the street scene or rural landscape. I am unable to accept the appellant's suggestion that it is prosaic and undistinguished. Even if I were to accept this, it would not represent a justification for introducing a bulky flat roof extension as is proposed here.
6. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (SHCSDMP) and Design

Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 as it is not of a high design quality.

Effect on protected species

7. The proposed development would involve alterations to the roof where there is the potential for an impact upon bats. No preliminary roost assessment or other form of ecological appraisal has been undertaken. Therefore, it has not been shown that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on protected species and it is thus contrary to policy CP14 of the SHCSDMP insofar as the development would result in harm to, or loss of, features of interest for biodiversity.
8. The appellant has suggested that a condition could be imposed to investigate whether bats are present prior to commencement of the development. However, as bats are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, even if I were minded to approve the proposed development, a condition to require bat surveys prior to the commencement of development cannot lawfully be imposed.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area and detrimental to protected species. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal is dismissed.

N Bowden

INSPECTOR