
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2021

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/W/20/3261038

30 Queen Mary Avenue, Camberley GU15 3BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Omar Qayyum against Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0317/FFU, is dated 31 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and single storey extension to existing garage and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and single storey extension to existing garage and associated works on land at 30 Queen Mary Avenue, Camberley GU15 3BF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0317/FFU and the plans submitted with it, 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: Location Plan and Block Plan Drawing 005; Proposed Ground Floor Plans Drawing 006; and Proposed Elevations Drawings 007 and 008.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the submission of the appeal against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period, the Council have clarified the position they would have taken had they determined the application. I have had regard to these submissions, in so far as they provide clarity in terms of the reasons why the Council would have refused planning permission had it done so. The main issue below is therefore informed by the Council's submissions.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached, two storey dwelling, that has previously been extended to the rear. The property also has a single detached garage.
5. The proposed addition would be single storey and would extend across the full width of the host property, with the internal floor level matching that of the existing dwelling. Windows are proposed in both side elevations. The existing garage would be extended forwards to join into the new extension and, thereby integrating it into the dwelling.
6. The proposed windows in the northern and southern elevations of the extension would face towards the rear garden areas of Nos 28 and 32 Queen Mary Street respectively. However, along both boundaries there is an established fence, which, notwithstanding the floor level of the extension, would minimise the potential for direct overlooking from these windows. There is further screening in the form of established planting within the garden of No 28. As such, the proposal would not result in any material loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
7. Whilst the extension would extend beyond the rear line of No 32, the proposed extension would be single storey, set away from the boundary and positioned behind the existing boundary fence. Furthermore, the appeal property lies to the north of No 32. As such, the proposed extension would not have an overbearing effect upon the rear garden area of No 32.
8. The proposed garage extension would increase the amount of built development along the boundary of the site with No 28. It would, however, be positioned to ensure the retention of a substantial gap between the appeal property and No 28. Moreover, this boundary is currently identified by a boundary fence which extends along its full length, along with substantial boundary planting located within the garden of No 28. As a consequence, the proposal would not represent a visually intrusive form of development, or result in an unacceptable loss of light and, would therefore, not be detrimental to the living conditions of occupiers of No 28.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal would not materially harm the living conditions of surrounding residents and, in this respect, would accord with Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, Principles 8.1 and 10.1 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure development proposals respect the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the identified conditions.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR