



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: 05 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/W/25/3371115

Flat 4, Stonehill House, 81 Guildford Road, Bagshot, Surrey GU19 5NS

- 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 John Baddeley against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0151/FFU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an additional floor at second floor level with Juliet balcony, internal alterations and changes to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice in the banner heading above. This is because the description given on the application and appeal forms was less accurate and contained references to matters which are not acts of development.
3. The appellant has made reference to an amended scheme which would not exceed the height of the existing building. However, I have not been provided with plans or details of this which, in any case, I would not be able to accept as it would likely represent an attempt to evolve the scheme. This would be contrary to the guidance provided at section 16 of the Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building, and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbours with particular regard to overlooking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The property comprises a substantial detached building which has been converted into flats. The building has been the subject of numerous extensions in the past and this has resulted in a mix of vernaculars and styles which do not read as a particularly harmonious composition. This proposal seeks to construct a further

extension in the form of an upwards addition to flat 4. The extension would present as an independent storey separate to the main portion of the roof structure. This would represent a further disjointed addition to the building which would fail to integrate satisfactorily with it.

6. Whilst I accept that the existing building is not particularly uniform or consistent in terms of its style and design, this is not a reason to further compound this situation through further unsympathetic additions.
7. I recognise that permissions for similar schemes were approved in the early 2000s however these permissions have since lapsed. In the intervening period, expectations of design standards have evolved and this includes a more recent version of the development plan and National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be contrary to policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (SHCSDMP) and Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (DGSPD) as it is not of a high design quality.

Living conditions

9. The proposal introduces windows to the new upper floor to the flat that would have vantage towards a neighbouring flat's roof terrace. Although the views between the facing windows and roof terrace would be somewhat oblique, they are in very close proximity and set at the same level. This would result in overlooking towards the roof terrace from the extension and vice versa. This would be to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring flat and to the users of the upper floor to the extension.
10. This could not be rectified through the use of obscure glazing as the windows to the proposed extension are to a habitable room and the use of obscure glazing to such important windows would deprive the occupants of a reasonable outlook.
11. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy DM9 of the SHCSDMP and DGSPD insofar as it would not respect the amenities of the neighbouring properties and uses.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has stated that the proposal would not cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. This, however, is a neutral consideration that weighs neither for, nor against, the proposal.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would be of an unsatisfactory design standard and would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours and the future occupants of the flat. The material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan and therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bowden

INSPECTOR