

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2022

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/22/3305869

27 Hamesmoor Way, Mytchett, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6JG

- 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 Shaun Carter against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1009/FFU, dated 9 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey side extension forming a workshop/garage/garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side extension forming a workshop/garage/garden room at 27 Hamesmoor Way, Mytchett, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/1009/FFU, dated 9 September 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Procedural matter

2. In response to a question in the appeal form relating to the description of the proposed development the appellant says that it remains unchanged from that stated on the application form. That is clearly not the case. The application form contains a lengthy description, including information as to height, size and materials. However, the first line of the description refers to the proposal as a '*single storey workshop/garden room*'.
3. The Council, in its decision notice, described the proposal as '*a single storey side extension forming a workshop/garage*.' I suspect that a possible cause of this change of description relates to the proposed insertion of a single garage door in the front elevation of the proposed extension.
4. No clarity on future use is provided in the appeal documentation. In the circumstances, and since the extension would be capable of being used as a workshop and/or a garage, I shall adopt a combination of both descriptions in this decision letter.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached dwelling set within a residential area. It has a reasonably sized garden of an irregular shape. A tall, well-formed beech hedge on the property's eastern boundary separates it from the access to 4 dwellings sited in a cul-de-sac to the east of the appeal property. The hedge currently provides effective screening to the appellant's side and rear garden and is an attractive feature in the street scene.
7. The proposed side extension would also protrude to the rear of the dwelling, well beyond the rear elevation. The Council takes the view, considering the already approved extensions to the dwelling, that the proposal would prove overly bulky, failing to be subordinate or sympathetic to the host property. Concern is also expressed that the extension would result in a loss of space to the side of the dwelling, and would be perceived as an overdevelopment and incongruous, especially when viewed from the east. The loss of the beech hedgerow, or parts of it, would accentuate the visual harm.
8. To my mind, the host property and its sizeable garden are more than capable of accommodating the proposed additional extension without giving rise to any of the usual symptoms of overdevelopment. Moreover, the appellant insists that the hedgerow would be retained, and if this were the case, most if not all the extension, when built, would not be seen from outside the site. I share the view that the hedgerow, were it retained in its entirety, would provide very effective screening such is its width, height, and healthy condition.
9. I am satisfied from what I saw that, given care, most if not all of the hedge could be retained. This of course would be beneficial to the amenity of the local area. But even, with the progress of time, the hedge's condition was to deteriorate, I do not consider that the proposed extension, were it to become more visually exposed, would result in the harmful consequences feared by the Council. Although deeper than most domestic garages or outbuildings, its design is such that it would not appear out of place in this built-up suburban environment.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension, if built, would sit acceptably in its visual and spatial context without harming the character or appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 requiring new development to achieve a high quality of design respecting local character and paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing and bulk, and to protect vegetation worthy of retention.

Conditions

11. The Council's suggested condition regarding materials shall be imposed in the interests of visual amenity.
12. It is necessary in the interests of certainty that the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
13. There is no suggestion either in the application or appeal documentation that the extension would be used other than as incidental to the host property. However, since the proposal relates to a possible workshop use, for the

avoidance of doubt and in the interests of protecting neighbouring living conditions, a condition is imposed to ensure that the future use of the extension is limited and controlled.

14. I consider a further condition to be necessary in the interests of local amenity, so as to protect the hedgerow during the construction process.

Other matters

15. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representations including the references to national policies and guidance, and to the Council's design guidance. These are important material considerations, but I do not find the development to be in material conflict with those aspects referred to. I have therefore, as required, determined the appeal in accordance with the provisions of the development plan since no material considerations indicate otherwise.
16. No other matter raised outweighs those considerations which led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: Ref 01a; 01b; 04; 7b; 7c & the unreferenced Proposed Floor Plans.
3. 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.
4. The extension hereby permitted shall be used solely for purposes incidental to the residential use of the property known as 27 Hamesmoor Way and shall not be used for commercial purposes.
5. No development shall commence until details showing measures for the protection of the beech hedge on the eastern boundary of the appeal property during the construction process have been submitted for the Council's written approval. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.