



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/21/3282725

39 Mychett Road, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6EG.

- 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 R. Kumar against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1229/FFU, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as *bedroom and bathroom to 1st Floor*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the development on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 37 Mychett Road in terms of its potential to result in an increased sense of enclosure, overlooking leading to a loss of privacy and to appear overbearing.

Reasons

First main issue

3. The appeal property, 39 Mychett Road is two-storey detached house, located in a residential area. It is in the Mychett Settlement Boundary and within the Historic Route Housing Character Area.
4. The property is located between two pairs of semi-detached houses, which in turn are set well forward of number 39. Given the size of its garden plot, detached form, overall footprint and siting it is uncharacteristic in comparison to the surrounding more modest semi-detached properties.
5. When viewed from the street it has a two-storey pitched roof outshot to its southern flank and a single storey pitched roof outshot to its northern flank. That to the north is wider than that to the south.
6. The appellant proposes a first floor addition on the north side of the dwelling, built over the existing single storey addition, to provide additional accommodation for his daughter and grandchildren. The proposed first floor

extension would be set back behind the main façade of the host property, such that while maintaining the existing eaves line the ridge line would be below that of the main dwelling. Thereby making it a subservient addition to this extent.

7. The proposed extension would bring the dwelling as extended closer to the boundary to number 37 at first floor level. However, I do not consider given the relationship between the two properties that this would result in the enhanced sense of enclosure feared by the Council.
8. However, in my judgement, due to the proposed design of the extension, including the lack of any modelling, when considered in conjunction with the form and appearance of the existing house, it would make for a very bland, bulky and somewhat utilitarian property as extended. The overall design is not helped by the large single window at first floor level that does not reflect the existing fenestration pattern.
9. I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed extension would, on balance, be detrimental to the architectural integrity of the host property, so as to appear as an incongruous and overly large addition all to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Borough Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011-2028 (Adopted February 2012) (CS+DMP); Guiding Principle MT3 of the Surrey Heath Development framework 2006-2028 Western Urban Area Character-Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted May 2012), Principles 10.1 and 10.3 of the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guid-Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted September 2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development and the need to respect and enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Second main issue

10. From my observations on site and given the relationship of number 39 to 37 I am not persuaded that the proposed addition would appear so overbearing as to cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 37 as asserted by the Council.
11. The scheme design proposes a window in the flank wall of the proposed extension, serving the new bedroom. Due to the location of number 39 behind number 37 I consider that there is, as suggested by the Council, the potential of overlooking of the rear private garden of number 37. This in turn would, in my opinion, result an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupants of this neighbouring dwelling.
12. I conclude in respect of the second main issue that while the proposed extension would not cause harm to living conditions by reason of an overbearing presence. However, it would result in a loss of privacy due to overlooking. Accordingly, the proposal would not accord with Policy DM9 of CS+DMP; principles 10.1 and 10.3 of the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guid Supplementary Planning Document 2017 and the Framework as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

Other Considerations

13. I appreciate the appellants' practical reasons for wishing to build the proposed extension. These matters do not, however, outweigh the harm that I have identified that the extension would cause to the host property and neighbouring residential living conditions.
14. The appellant has drawn to my attention concerns relating to difficulties engaging with the Council during the determination of the original application for planning permission. This however is not relevant to my consideration of the planning merits of this appeal.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR