
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 January 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/D3640/D/19/3237698

5 Linkway, Camberley GU15 2NH

- 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 Craig Darrah against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0328, dated 11 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey front extension with associated works. Erection of entrance gates and piers to a maximum height of 2m. (Amended plans received 07/06/2019).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/D3640/D/19/3237697

5 Linkway, Camberley GU15 2NH

- 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 Craig Darrah against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0532, dated 27 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of three bay garage extension and new gates to boundary.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

3. In respect of both appeals, I have used the description of development shown on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form in the banner heading because it is more precise than the description shown on the planning application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located in an established residential area, which predominantly consists of 2 storey detached dwellings of varying architectural design. The dwellings are set back from the highway and are sited on generous plots. Taken together with the trees and hedging that is visible in the street scene, the area has a spacious and verdant character. The appeal property is positioned on a corner plot and it is set back from the boundaries with Linkway and Kingsley Avenue, which is also reflected by the neighbouring corner plot property at No 2 Kingsley Avenue. The siting of the corner dwellings provides openness around the road junction, which contributes to the spacious and green feel of the area.
6. Guidance in Principle 10.1 of the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 states that extensions which erode garden spaces and gaps which contribute to visual amenity and character will be resisted. Furthermore, Principle 10.2 states that front extensions should not protrude too far forward from the main building line, or be prominent in the street scene.
7. The proposed development in respect of Appeal A would extend a considerable distance of around 10.4 metres to the front of the dwelling, which would bring it close to the boundary. Taken together with the height of the proposed extension, at around 5.0 metres, it would not be subordinate to the existing dwelling and would appear prominent and visually intrusive in the street scene. The proposed extension, owing to its size and siting, would erode the openness around the road junction, which would be harmful to the spacious character of the area.
8. The proposed development in respect of Appeal B would have lower ridge and eaves heights than Appeal A (approximately 3.0 metres and 2.15 metres tall respectively), however it would have a similar footprint and would therefore extend a considerable distance to the front of the dwelling. Whilst it would appear less dominant and bulky than Appeal A, it would still amount to a prominent addition that would erode the openness around the road junction and harm the spacious character of the area.
9. I acknowledge that there is a hedge on the boundary, however this is a natural feature that cannot be relied upon in perpetuity to screen views of the appeal schemes in the street. In any event, there would be views of the appeal schemes from Kingsley Avenue above the boundary fence, which is around 2 metres tall.
10. Whilst there are some nearby front garages in the area, the appeal schemes would appear more prominent in the street scene due to their siting and excessive size. Nevertheless, I have determined the appeal schemes on their individual planning merits.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the developments proposed by Appeal A and Appeal B would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area. The appeal schemes would therefore be contrary to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, and guidance in the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017, which, amongst other

things, seek high quality design and development that respects and enhances local character. The appeal schemes would also be contrary to Chapter 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which, amongst other things, states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

12. I have had regard to the appellant's statement that the garage space is needed for hobbies and activities and that additional floorspace is required for his family. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
13. Local residents have raised concerns, which, further to the above matter, include: increased noise and activity; potential loss of the hedgerow; and, the development could be used for separate accommodation. However, as I find the proposed development unacceptable for other reasons, these considerations would not alter my decision.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR