
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2026

by **F Leung BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/25/3376364

15 Iberian Way, Camberley, Surrey GU15 1LZ

- 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 & Mrs Syed Syed against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0697/FFU.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as the “erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey first floor side extension with new flat roof, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and internal alterations, following demolition of existing conservatory”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey rear extension and first floor side extension, replacement of front porch, conversion of garages into habitable accommodation with internal alterations and changes to fenestration, following demolition of existing conservatory and landscaping works including relocation of retaining wall, at 15 Iberian Way, Camberley, Surrey GU15 1LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0697/FFU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with Drawing Nos S01, D01 (Rev. A), D02 (Rev. A), D03 (Rev. A), D04 (Rev. A), D05 (Rev. B) and D06 (Rev. B).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows on north-east and south-west elevations as shown on Drawing No D02 (Rev. A) have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once the windows are installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the proposal comprises the erection of a two-storey rear extension and first floor side extension, replacement of front porch, conversion of garages into habitable accommodation with internal alterations and changes to fenestration, following demolition of existing conservatory and landscaping works including relocation of retaining wall. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I. I note that the appellant has also used this description of development on their appeal form.
3. In December 2024, the Council has submitted the Pre-Submission Surrey Heath Local Plan (2019-2039) (the emerging LP) for Regulation 19 examination under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England). Policy DH1 of the emerging LP is cited in the Council's submission as relevant to character and appearance. Having regard to paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and mindful of the status of the emerging policy, I give some limited weight to this policy in my assessment below.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building and its surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a single-storey integrated garage to the north-east. It lies in a predominantly residential area of detached dwellings of varied styles with generous front and rear gardens. Although front building lines and plot rhythm are broadly consistent in the area, both the appeal site and adjoining 13 Iberian Way have wider plots and footprints.
6. I have been provided with the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (the RDG) and the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the WUAC). These documents advise that extensions should be subordinate and consistent in form, scale, architectural style and materials with the original building. I also note that Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2011-2028 (the CSDMP) expects developments to incorporate and reflect design and character measures as set in these documents. These measures include lower ridge heights, recessed building lines, the use of matching roof forms, materials, fenestration, and other design details. Insofar as the appeal is concerned, the policy sets out that extensions that create a terracing effect or erode important gaps which contribute to visual amenity will be resisted.
7. The proposed front and side extension would introduce two additional two-storey front gables, extend the main roof to the north-east and partially infill the gap between the site and adjoining 17 Iberian Way.

8. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would have neither a recessed building line nor a lower ridge height, and it would increase massing and alter the dwelling's appearance. However, tall front gable features are a common feature of nearby properties, and the front building line and frontage width would remain broadly unchanged. Moreover, its style, materials, overall height and fenestration would match the host building.
9. In respect of the partial infilling of the gap between buildings, there is variation in styles and plot sizes throughout the street. This results in gaps of different sizes between buildings. While there is a notable gap between No 13 and the appeal property, the appeal property is built very close to its shared boundary with No 17. The open gap above the existing garage has an enclosed view framed by the two-storey side wall of No 17 and the roof of the appeal property. This gap makes only a limited contribution to the area's character, being perceptible mainly in immediate views from the front of the site. No 17 also sits on higher ground with a higher ridge.
10. For these reasons, together with the incorporation of the proposed roof pitch and set-back from the floor below, the proposed extension would not result in a harmful loss of an important building gap and would not visually link the two properties. Accordingly, the proposed development would not harm the character of the host building or surrounding area, complying with the RDG and the WUAC.
11. The Council raised no objection to the proposed two-storey rear extension element due to its siting to the rear of the dwelling, and I see no reason to disagree with that conclusion based on the evidence before me.
12. Overall, I conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or its surrounding area. It therefore accords with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and Policy DH1 of the emerging LP, which are both consistent in their requirements for developments to respect and reinforce local character, having regard to scale, height, massing, materials and detailing.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a set of conditions in the event that the appeal is allowed. In imposing conditions, I have had regard to the tests within the National Planning Policy Framework, the Planning Practice Guidance, and relevant statute, and have accordingly amended the wording of certain conditions proposed by the Council without altering their aim.
14. Conditions specifying the time for commencement and compliance with the approved plans have been imposed. These are necessary for certainty. A further condition requiring external materials to match the existing has been imposed. This is necessary to preserve the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
15. A condition requiring the new windows on both side elevations to be obscure-glazed and non-opening below 1.7m has been imposed in the interests of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the proposal accords with the development plan. No material considerations indicate otherwise. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

F Leung

INSPECTOR