



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2026

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2026

Appeal Ref: 3377463

Oakwood Cottage, 4 Queens Road, Bisley, GU24 9AN

- 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 Anthony Duff against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0955/FFU.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of part single part two side and rear extensions including extension to front and rear dormers. Changes to fenestration and materials. Repositioning of air conditioning unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of part single part two side and rear extensions including extension to front and rear dormers. Changes to fenestration and materials. Repositioning of air conditioning unit at Oakwood Cottage, 4 Queens Road, Bisley, GU24 9AN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0955/FFU and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following 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 extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, or as set out in the application form.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: A2.1, A1.1, A2.2, A1.2, A2.0 and A1.0.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its setting. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 2C Queens Road (No.2C), with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is situated within an established residential area at the northeasterly end of Queens Road. This area includes a diverse range of two storey dwellings, occupying a variety of sized plots and where gaps between dwellings vary. The grass verges, wooded and open green spaces and the views between buildings towards areas of woodland and fields enclosed by hedges and trees contribute to the transition between the built up area along Guildford Road and the area of well wooded countryside and linear groups of houses further to the southwest along Queens Road.

4. The appeal property is located within a small cluster of detached and attached dwellings that are set back and screened from Queens Road by a narrow belt of woodland trees and associated ground cover. These dwellings have good sized front gardens which are enclosed by hedges and include varying amounts of soft planting. The gaps between the dwellings vary with wider gaps between the dwellings at the south-westerly end of the access drive. Immediately to the north and northeast of this cluster of dwellings is a modern housing development (Queens Close), where houses project closer to the highway and the gaps between the dwelling are predominantly narrow.
5. Both physically and visually the appeal dwelling relates more closely to the development in Queens Close than the development on the opposite side of Queens Road. On the opposite side of Queens Road, the pairs of dwellings have good sized gaps between them and they occupy a very spacious setting set back from the road behind a deep area of open grassland with occasional trees.
6. The appeal dwelling comprises a detached modern chalet style house with front and rear facing wide box dormer windows. On one side the dwelling projects close to the boundary and adjacent dwelling to the southwest and on the other side there is a recessed garage that projects up to the boundary with No.2C. In immediate views from the front of the site the open gap above the garage affords an enclosed view of the side walls and roof of the dwelling located immediately to the rear of the appeal site.
7. Amongst other things policy DM9 (i) & (ii) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012) (SHCSDMP), require proposals to be of high quality design and to respect and enhance the character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk, and density. Policy DH1 2) a) of the Pre-Submission Surrey Heath Local Plan (2019 – 2038) (Regulation 19), (SHLPPS) has similar objectives.
8. Principle 10.1 and paragraphs 10.5 and 10.6 of the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD), advise that extensions are expected to be subordinate and consistent in form, scale and architectural style and materials of the original building. Design solutions to achieve this include lower ridge heights, recessed building lines, the use of matching roof forms, materials, fenestration, and other design details. Extensions which erode gaps that contribute to the visual amenity of the area will be resisted. Important gaps between buildings should be maintained. Similarly, extensions should not result in material loss of amenity for the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
9. The proposed extension would infill the recess to the front of the existing garage and the existing first floor dormers and roof would be continued over both. The new front dormer would have a pitched crown roof and the resultant rear dormer would retain a flat roof.
10. The proposed extension has been designed to appear as an integral part of the original dwelling and its proportions, scale, design, detailing and appearance all respect and reinforce that of the host dwelling. It would retain the simple and uncluttered lines of the host dwelling. As it would be indistinguishable from the original dwelling it would not be prominent or otherwise detract from the host dwelling. This is subject to adherence to the submitted drawings and the use of matching materials for the walls and roof of the extensions. Alternatively, the dormer cheeks could be clad with weatherboard cladding, as set out on the application form. As suggested by the council, this is something that could be secured through the imposition of planning conditions.
11. Whilst the proposed extension does not have recessed building lines or a lower ridge height, it would be subordinate and consistent in form, scale and architectural style and materials to the original building. As advised in SPD paragraphs 1.8 – 1.10 the guidelines in the SPD are a material consideration in the consideration of proposals. It also recognises that the principles set out in the guide may not be applicable in all situations

and that some designs may not fully comply with the guidelines. Where this happens any design justifications will be taken into account as a material consideration. In this instance I find that the proposed extension complies with the objectives of the SPD.

12. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting. Accordingly, in this respect it would comply with SHCSDMP Policies DM9(iii) & DH1 2) f) and the objectives of SPD Principles 10.1 & 10.3.

Living conditions

13. The proposed side extension would project up to the side boundary of the host property and its front wall would project approximately 1.6 metres to the front of the first-floor front elevation of the dwelling at No.2C. The flank wall of the proposed side extension would be at least two metres from the adjacent front facing bedroom window at No.2C and its roof would hip away from the front elevation. The proposed dormer window would be recessed back from the front of the roof-slope and would be sited over three metres from the adjacent bedroom window at No.33.
15. As a result of these factors the outlook from the adjacent bedroom window at No.2C would remain open and would receive good levels of daylight and sunlight. The proposed extension would only be visible from the bedroom window in limited oblique views and would not be visually oppressive or overbearing.
16. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would respect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Accordingly, the proposal complies with SHCSDMP Policies DM9(iii), SHLPPS Policy DH1 2) f) and SPD Principles 10.1 & 10.3, which all seek to ensure that extensions do not result in a material loss of amenity for the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

17. Having regard to the conclusions on the main issues and all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR