



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2022

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/22/3295892

7 Christie Close, Lightwater, Surrey GU18 5UG

- 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 and Mrs Kurt Ashwood against the decision of the Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1255/FFU dated 16 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a two storey side and rear extension, erection of front porch and alterations to the front and rear fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed from that stated on the planning form. Notwithstanding this, I have used the description as used on the Council's decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposal as shown on the plans and I have considered the appeal on this basis

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. Christie Close is a residential street which skirts the rear of the A422 to the north. Dwellings in the street vary in appearance and style, including use of red and yellow brick, timber details, tiled roofs and tile hangings. I was able to see a number of properties with varying additions and alterations.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot, where the road bends round the appeal site, with a slight rise in levels travelling past the site. It features hipped roofs with tile hangings to the first floor, including a pitched roof to the front porch and a catslide roof over the garage. The neighbouring property at no. 5 Christie Close sits slightly further forward of the appeal property, with the rooflines of both properties being staggered.

6. The development would introduce a two storey side extension to the existing dwelling, requiring the demolition of the garage element. To the front, a hipped gable extension would be provided, with a stepped ridgeline set below the existing subservient ridgeline. The proposals would provide similar hipped gable features to the rear, with hipped gables and a chimney facing the roadside. The development would protrude forward of the existing side extension and garage element.
7. The development would introduce a bulky addition to the side of the existing dwelling. The resultant rooflines, combined with the width of the two storey element would appear as substantial and disproportionate to the dwelling. The dwelling is located on slightly higher ground than the street, and as a result of the height of the proposed extension and the blank elevation facing the street, the extended bulk of the dwelling as seen from the road would be accentuated, creating a dominant and uncharacteristic addition to the street. As seen from the street and in the context of the adjacent neighbouring property, the additions would appear bulky and dominant, and are not in character or scale to the dwelling or the appearance of the local area.
8. Whilst I acknowledge that the development would respect the overall form and character of the existing dwellings, including matching materials and features, the development as a whole would remain dominant and these would not overcome the harm identified. I also acknowledge that there are other properties which flank their boundaries with the street or pavement. The circumstances in each proposal are likely to be different, and in any event the fact that apparently similar extensions may have been permitted is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
9. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed two storey side extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore be in conflict with the guidance in the Council's RDG¹ and also principle B2 of the LVDS² and Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy³ which expect new developments to achieve a high quality in relation to the scale and design, and all of which require (amongst other things) that development have regard to and protect or enhance, the local character of the area. As a result, the proposal would also be contrary to a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework, which in relation to new development, seeks to secure high quality design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the proposal is unacceptable and the appeal should not succeed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR

¹ Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (September 2017)

² Lightwater Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document (October 2007)

³ Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (February 2012)