



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/21/3289959
33 Firwood Drive, Camberley GU15 3QD

- 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 Chaim Shultz against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0449/FFU, dated 20 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 08 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Erection of a single storey rear extension with two roof lanterns, 1st floor extension above garage, insertion of pitched roof dormer to front roof plane along with two roof lights and insertion of roof light to rear roof plane.'
-

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 occupants of neighbouring property; specifically, the occupants of no. 31 Firwood Drive.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a bungalow with accommodation in the roof. It fronts Firwood Drive, a residential street with a varied mix of dwelling types and sizes. Firwood Drive has an open and verdant character by virtue of the varied setback of dwellings from the road, and the mature landscaping and trees within the public realm and private gardens. The appeal proposal seeks to extend the roof across the existing single storey attached garage to create additional accommodation at first floor level and would include a pitched roofed dormer within the front roofslope. The proposal also seeks to construct a single storey flat roof rear extension, with raised roof lanterns.

5. The host dwelling fills almost the entire width of the plot at ground floor level and the first-floor roof extension would simply fill a gap at first floor level. However, despite the relatively low height and low profile of the dwelling in contrast to neighbouring properties, the side-to-side roof pitch emphasises the width of the existing dwelling. Further extending the width of the roof at the same ridge height would exacerbate the sense of plot coverage and width at first floor level. Whilst there is a varied degree of plot coverage within the area, the appeal proposal would create an incongruous, cramped appearance due to its close proximity with the boundary and the extended two storey neighbouring dwelling. Moreover, it would close a gap at first floor level within the streetscene which contributes to the vernacular sense of openness.
6. Whilst the pitched roof dormer is not typical of the style of dormer utilised on chalet type bungalows such as the host dwelling, there is significant architectural variety within the vicinity and pitched roof dormers of a modest scale are not out of keeping with the character of the area.
7. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it is contrary to policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (CS), adopted in 2012, and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies seek, amongst other things, to secure high-quality design which respects local character.

Living conditions

8. The deepest projection of the proposed single storey rear extension is close to the boundary with no.31 Firwood Drive. Whilst the proposal would have a flat roof, its eaves height, depth and closest raised lantern would have an overbearing and imposing impact on the living conditions of no.31 Firwood Drive. It would particularly affect the patio and garden area closest to the house, as well as outlook from the kitchen. This would be exacerbated by the topography and the relative ground levels. Whilst there is currently a hedge in place between these two properties, it would not effectively screen the highest element of the rear extension. Any future removal of the hedge would also result in direct or perceived overlooking of the rear garden of no.31 Firwood Drive due to the proposed facing flank windows.
9. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. The appeal proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM9 of the CS and the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development respects the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, in so far as they are consistent with the Framework. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR