



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/19/3237791

52 Angelica Road, Bisley, Woking GU24 9EY

- 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 and Mrs Hamblen against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0383, dated 2 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor extension on eastern side of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located in a residential area, close to the junction between Angelica Road and Quince Drive. The area is characterised by detached houses of differing designs set back from the road, with attached or detached single storey garages. The area has a pleasant sense of openness as a result of the design and layout of the dwellings, and the space between the buildings.
5. The new extension would be constructed above the attached garage and would be a similar depth to the host property. The ridge height of the extension's roof would be the same as the existing roof and a gable feature would be introduced.
6. Although the scale of the resultant dwelling would be similar to nearby development in Angelica Road, including the 'Tudor' style dwelling opposite, I find that the extension, with its prominent gable feature would be a dominant and prominent addition which would not reflect the character or appearance of the host dwelling. Moreover, the integral garage that would result would be an incongruous feature in the streetscape. The contribution that the property makes to this pleasant residential area would be reduced as a consequence.

7. Furthermore, the proposal would result in the erosion of the visual gap at first floor level between the host property and its neighbour at No 50. This would result in significant harm being caused to the spacious, open qualities of the area. The resultant relationship between Nos 52 and 50 would be uncharacteristic of the locality along Angelica Road, even taking account of the off-set front elevations that exist. The proposal would result in this part of Angelica Road being less pleasant and spacious than the remainder of the road and harm to its character and appearance would result.
8. The appellants have drawn my attention to a number of properties in the locality including Holly Corner, No 26 Angelica Road, and No 4 Quince Drive, which whilst not containing large gaps at first floor level, were the exception rather than the rule in this area. Similarly, whilst No 46 Angelica Road embodies a mock-Tudor vernacular, the property also demonstrates a gap at first floor level above a garage which is the type which the appeal proposal would remove. I consider that No 1 Angelica Road is too far away from the appeal site to be directly comparable. These examples do not alter my findings, nor do they provide justification for harmful development.
9. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, contrary to Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2011 - 2028 (adopted February 2012) which requires development, amongst other matters, to be of a high quality design which respects and enhances the local character. The proposal also conflicts with the advice on side extensions contained within the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted September 2017) in terms of subservience and the character of the street scene. Moreover, the proposal is not in accordance with paragraph 127 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters and Planning Balance

10. A number of factors have been cited in support of the proposal, including the letter of support from a neighbour; the lack of objection from Bisley Parish Council; the lack of objection from the Council's Arboricultural Officer; that the proposal does not extend the footprint of the original dwelling; and that the proposal is acceptable in relation to any impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. These factors are not in dispute and carry neutral weight in my consideration of the proposal. The proposal would improve the living accommodation available to the appellants. However, as this would mainly be a private benefit, this has been given very limited weight.
11. In conclusion, I find that the matters advanced in support of the proposal, do not, either individually or collectively, outweigh the harm identified, nor the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR