
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by H Baugh-Jones BA(Hons) DipLA MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/16/3155333

13 Iberian Way, Camberley, Surrey GU15 1LU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tekin Djemil against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0241, dated 7 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor front/side extension and conversion of loft space to provide additional bedroom and ancillary space served by rooflights in side and rear roof plane and two dormers to front roof plane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of development given in the heading above is taken from the appeal form as it provides the most accurate description of the proposal and is the one used on the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a substantial detached dwelling set back from the highway behind an extensive frontage. It lies within a mature residential area comprising detached dwellings of varying style and proportion set on relatively spacious plots. The mix of dwellings results in a notable absence of any dominant building style but their respective sizes are generally proportionate to the various plot widths. The surrounding area includes groups of mature trees, which in combination with those in nearby front and rear gardens creates some semblance of a verdant area. However, as the most prominent of these trees are set some distance away, I do not consider them to be a defining characteristic of the Iberian Way street scene.
 5. The differences in building styles and plot sizes gives rise to variation in the gaps between dwellings. However, there are notable gaps between the appeal property and those on either side. This separation is reinforced by the appeal property's hipped roof form, which also serves to minimise its overall bulk and
-

- mass. This is particularly apparent on the dwelling's north-eastern side where the roof runs down to just above ground floor height.
6. The property has a single storey garage with a hipped roof projecting forward of the dwelling's main elevation. At the other end of the dwelling is a two-storey front facing pitched roof gable. Together these features sit in harmony with the overall proportions of the dwelling to give it a pleasing asymmetric form.
 7. The proposed additions to the front and side of the appeal property would substantially increase its overall bulk and mass at its north-eastern end and would reduce the amount of space between the dwelling and that at No. 15. Thus, it would be at odds with the proportions of the neighbouring dwellings, diminish the characteristic space between them and result in there being a disproportionate overall spread of built form across the plot.
 8. The proposal also includes the addition of two dormers on the front part of the dwelling's main roof. These substantial additions would result in there being windows at three levels. In combination with the proposed window in the uppermost part of the front gable extension, I share the Council's view that this would serve to create the perception of a three-storey dwelling, which would appear at odds with the two-storey form of those surrounding it. Furthermore, the dormers would detract from the unfettered appearance of the existing roof and their off-set to the windows on the first floor beneath would disrupt the rhythm of the building. Overall, the totality of the proposal would result in the dwelling's existing character being all but lost.
 9. The effects I have described above would be particularly incongruous in views along Iberian Way from the north-east, which would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. I recognise that Iberian Way is a cul-de-sac but it nonetheless forms part of the public realm.
 10. My attention has been drawn to a number of other nearby schemes, which the appellant argues, give credence to the appeal proposal. However, I do not have full details of what led to these developments being considered acceptable and cannot therefore draw any useful comparisons between them and the scheme before me. In any case, each application and appeal must be judged on its own merits.
 11. Taking all of the above into account, the appeal proposal would run counter to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012), which amongst other things, requires development to be of high quality design and respect local character. Furthermore, the reduction in space at the side of the dwelling and substantial diminishment of its post-war design would conflict with Guiding Principles PO1 and PO3 of the Surrey Heath Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Hayden Baugh-Jones

Inspector