



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/22/3292931

40 Horsebrass Drive, Bagshot GU19 5RB

- 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 Mrs Sally Richards against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1354/FFU, dated 17 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Two storey side extension and front dormer (resubmission of 21/1007/FFU)'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the amended description.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and,
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupants of the development.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, with a full two storeys to the rear, and a steeply sloping catslide roof giving the appearance of a single storey with accommodation in the roof to the front. The dwelling has a large hipped-roofed dormer in the front elevation roof slope. The appeal site is within a predominantly residential area with a tight grain of development on a planned estate form. The appeal site is located at a sweeping corner of the road, creating a splayed gap with the adjacent set of semi-detached dwellings.
 5. The appeal proposal seeks to demolish an existing outbuilding and construct a two storey side extension. Due to the atypical gap in built form, the proposed side extension would not result in a cramped appearance of overdevelopment
-

and would integrate well with the varied scale of surrounding development. The proposed set-down from the main roof ridge would also create an appearance of a subservient addition which would not unbalance the semi-detached pair. The additional proposed dormer window would not be out of keeping with the wider area, which features a range of fenestration types, hipped and gabled roofs, window bays and other prominent architectural features. The low profile and unassuming appearance of the existing dwelling would negate any additional prominence resulting from the additional dormer window.

6. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. In this respect, the proposal complies with policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted in 2012, and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a high standard of design which provides a good standard of amenity, which integrates well with its surroundings and maintains the character of the area.

Living conditions

7. The appeal proposal would result in the loss of a few square metres of private residential garden area. I acknowledge that some minor reconfiguration of the on-site parking may claw-back some of the garden area lost to the development. Whilst the loss of garden area would be minimal due to the limited additional ground coverage at ground floor level, the proposal would create an additional bedroom space and the private outdoor amenity area would therefore serve a larger, family sized dwelling.
8. The Residential Design Guide (RDG) advises that an appropriate minimum outdoor private amenity space for a two-bedroom dwelling is 65 square metres. Whilst this is guidance and should not be applied inflexibly, the outdoor amenity space for the resulting development would fall well below the suggested standard at approximately 40 square metres, clearly indicating it would make insufficient provision for private amenity space.
9. The Appellant advises that the proposed extension is to meet the present and future needs of the current occupants of the dwelling and their growing family, thereby avoiding the need to seek assistance with social housing. This is a clear benefit to the scheme to which I attach significant weight. However, that benefit is limited by the poor standard of accommodation which would result from the scheme, which would fail to sufficiently meet the needs of occupiers. Moreover, there is no evidence before me in respect of any additional accommodation which may be achieved under permitted development rights to an equivalent effect by way of a 'fallback position'.
10. For these reasons, I consider that the appeal scheme would result in a poor standard of living conditions for future occupiers of the development, which is not outweighed by the benefit of additional internal accommodation arising from the scheme. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM9 of the DMP.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan. This harm is not outweighed by the

limited benefits arising from the proposed development. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR