



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: 3rd February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/21/3285520

2 Glynswood, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1HU.

- 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 Ms Chantelle Marie against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0749/FFU, dated 30 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at 2 Glynswood, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1HU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0749/FFU, dated 30 June 2021, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) No construction work above first floor plate level of the extension hereby approved shall commence before details of the dressing room/ensuite bathroom window/windows have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: AD4546 Sheet 1 *Existing plans, elevations and site plan* and AD4546 Sheet 2 *Proposed plans, elevations and site plan* Rev A 18/6/2021.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 2 Glynswood is a two-storey detached house. It is one of an estate of similarly designed houses. While generally the houses have

retained the essential essence of their original design many have been extended and altered over time.

4. Number 2 is located on a large, unique, and prominent corner plot at the entrance of Glynswood from the Portsmouth Road.
5. The appellant proposes a two-storey side addition facing the estate road and extending the house towards the Portsmouth Road. The proposed extension would have a pitched roof that would maintain the ridge height and eaves line of the host property. The external finishes and fenestration would reflect those of the original dwelling. In my judgement therefore for these reasons I consider the proposed addition would appear as a well-mannered addition, that had been designed in the context and character of this post war property.
6. I appreciate that in terms of its length and height the proposed addition may not be considered subservient to the host property. However, given the shallow pitch of the existing main roof I am not persuaded that a lower roof here or a lowered eaves line would necessarily be an appropriate design solution. In addition, the first floor addition would be set back from the main façade behind a mono pitch roof at first floor level. This feature would serve to visually reduce the perceived mass and form of the extension as designed, while setting the first floor back from the street facade.
7. The proposed addition would extend the house closer to the Portsmouth Road and would to some limited extent reduce the depth of the side garden. Nevertheless, I do not consider that due to the overall size and openness of this corner plot it would be significantly diminished by the proposed extension. Further, I do not believe the addition would appreciably denude views towards the established landscaping to the rear.
8. From my observations on site the line of the buildings facing Portsmouth Road is already irregular and not, in my opinion, a significant feature here. Accordingly, the proposed addition would not breach an established or significant building line. Furthermore, I do consider that, particularly as this is a corner plot, where deviation from a building line can add visual interest to a development, the proposed addition would be harmful to any established or perceived building line.
9. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed addition would not cause harm to either the architectural integrity of the host property or the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policy DNM9 of the Surrey Heath borough Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011–2028 (Adopted February 2012), Guiding Principles PC1, PC2, PC4 and WUA3 of the Surrey Heath Development Framework 2006–2028 Western Urban Area Character-Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted May 2012), Principles 7.1 and 10.3 of the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide-Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted September 2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development and the need to respect and enhance local character.

Conditions

10. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
11. As identified by the Council the design of the first floor window serving the dressing room and ensuite bathroom is shown on plan as two windows with a joining piece to receive the partition wall and on elevation as just one window. As the design of the fenestration is critical to the quality of the development in the context of this post war estate, I will require details of the window to be approved by the local planning authority.
12. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR