The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2022

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/22/3303461
13 Hewlett Place, Bagshot, Surrey GU19 5NA

- 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 Jamie Maxwell against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
- The application Ref 22/0242/FFU, dated 12 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2022.
- The development proposed is a 2 storey front extension with a replacement detached garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey front extension with a replacement detached garage in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/0242/FFU, dated 12 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DMED-02-22(1), DMED-02-22(2), DMED-02-22(3) and DMED-02-22(4).

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on: (i) the character and appearance of this part of Hewlett Place; and (ii) living conditions at 14 Hewlett Place next door, in terms of light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Hewlett Place is laid out with pedestrian access to the front of a row of semi-detached houses and road access to the rear. Nos 12 and 13 form the last

pair of semis in the row, with No 14 beyond being detached. The proposal is to build a 2 storey extension at the front and to replace the flat roofed garage at the back with a slightly larger garage. The Council's concerns relate to the 2 storey front extension only. I likewise find no objection to the proposed new garage.

4. The pedestrian walkway at the front is an attractive, well landscaped space, with the houses set back to allow for planting in front gardens. The houses are of similar design, but with some variations including one storey front sections, as seen for example at No 12. Principle 10.2 of the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises that front extensions should not protrude too far forward or be prominent in the street scene and that 2 storey front extensions will only be acceptable where the building is set well back from the street.

5. The proposed extension, though 2 storey, would be modest in scale and set well back from the footway, leaving most of the front garden untouched. It would be seen at the end of the row, next to No 14 which already steps forward, so that the extension would not bring built development forward significantly here. It would have a low roof line, well below that of the existing house. In this particular situation, and bearing in mind that there are already variations in the house frontages and building line, the proposed front extension would not appear intrusive or out of place. Its straightforward, simple design would furthermore fit in well with the character of the house and neighbouring houses.

6. I conclude that the proposal would reasonably harmonise with and would not harm the character and appearance of this part of Hewlett Place. It accords with the aims of policy DM9 of the Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2011-2028 (CS), Principles 10.1 and 10.2 of the SPD and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), to secure high quality design that respects and enhances local character.

Living conditions

7. No 14 has a fully glazed conservatory on the side next to No 13. The extension would sit directly to the east of the conservatory so that it would block out some morning sunlight and would introduce a substantial new wall into close range views through the side glazing and roof. The conservatory would, however, retain its open, southerly aspect for sunlight and would continue to benefit from good daylighting. Likewise, its main views to the front and rear would be unaffected. Light and views at the side are already to some extent compromised by trees, further minimising the proposal's impact.

8. I conclude that the proposal would not significantly affect living conditions at No 14, in terms of either light or outlook. In this respect it also accords with the aims of CS policy DM9, Principles 10.1 and 10.2 of the SPD and the Framework, to ensure that developments respect the amenities of occupants of neighbouring properties.

Other matters

9. I have considered all other matters raised. I note in particular the local concern about disruption from construction operations in this quiet situation with no

road access. This matter could be addressed through other legislation if these small scale works did become a nuisance.

Conditions

10. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. The use of matching materials is necessary in the interest of local character and appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR