



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by David Carter BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/19/3235974

66 Heathpark Drive, Windlesham GU20 6AR

- 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 Daniel Moulton against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0268, dated 22 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first-floor extension over the top of the existing garage and kitchen, to create two additional bedrooms and change one existing bedroom to a second bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a first-floor extension over the top of the existing garage and kitchen, to create two additional bedrooms and change one existing bedroom to a second bathroom at No. 66 Heathpark Drive, Windlesham GU20 6AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/0268, dated 22 March 2019, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - a. Proposed Side Extension of Property Above Existing Garage and Kitchen, Ref No: 66-HPD-PLAN-001.
 - b. Block Plan, Ref: 66-HPD-PLAN-002
 - c. Amended Site Plan (Titled: Construction Exclusion Zone, Material Laydown and Mixing Area Layout) received 19/06/2019.
 - 3) No development above slab level shall commence until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.
 - 4) Within one week of the commencement of development, photographs shall be provided to the Council's Arboricultural Officer for approval. These should record all aspects of any facilitation tree works and the physical tree and ground protection measures having been implemented and maintained in accordance with the plan identified in 2)c. above. The tree protection

measures shall be retained until the substantial completion of all works hereby permitted.

- 5) Demolition or construction works and delivery/removal of materials shall take place only between 0730 to 1800 on Mondays to Fridays, 0800 to 1300 on Saturdays, and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area, in particular of views of the backdrop of trees to the rear of the property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is on the western side of Heathpark Drive within a residential area. It comprises of a two-storey detached dwelling. Nearby dwellings are of a similar size and style. There is a spacious feel to the locality with large gardens to the front. Some possess large, mature trees. To the rear there is a substantial area of mature trees. The site is within an Area Tree Preservation Order.
4. The main identified concern with the proposal is that by building over the existing single storey garage to the side of the property, the effect would be to reduce the views of the trees to the rear through the gap between the adjacent houses.
5. I do not share this concern in the particular circumstances of this appeal. Similar extensions over garages have been built on several nearby properties including 64 Heathpark Drive. These do not lead to a noticeable reduction in character and appearance nor do they dominate the street scene. A 2m gap between the walls of Nos. 64 and 66 would remain at first floor level. Furthermore, the proposal does not increase the building's existing footprint so I have no reason to anticipate that the impact would be different to the other examples. The depth of the front gardens in the immediate vicinity of the site would also have the effect of reducing the impact of the gaps when viewed from the footway.
6. Most importantly, however, views of the group of mature trees to the rear of the appeal site would still be visible above the main roof from Heathpark Drive due to their height, as well as through the remaining, narrower gap. Thus, the proposal would have a negligible impact if any. Additionally, the mature trees on the frontages significantly add to the attractive visual appearance of the area. Taken together it appears to me that the appeal proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. I also note that the Council raise no other concerns with the proposed extension.
7. Therefore, I conclude the proposal is consistent with the design principles set out in Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, 2012, as well as Policy WNP2.2 of the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan, 2019. The proposal is also consistent with the provisions of the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide. These documents seek to ensure a high quality of design in new development.

Conditions

8. I have attached 5 conditions. These include the usual conditions (1 and 2) dealing with time limits and approved plans. Condition 3 deals with construction materials and is required to ensure that the development responds to the character and appearance of the area. In addition, I have included a condition (4) on the lines suggested by the Council to ensure adequate protection for trees both to the front and rear of the property during the construction period. I have also included a condition (5) restricting hours of working to protect the living conditions of nearby residents.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons stated above I allow this appeal subject to conditions.

David Carter

INSPECTOR