



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2023

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/22/3310411

22 Clewborough Drive, Camberley, Surrey GU15 1NX

- 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 Umair Pervaiz against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0249/FFU, dated 15 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2022.
 - The proposed development is new double storey extension to front and rear of the property and single storey extension to rear; demolition of the double garage and replacement double garage to be constructed in a different location.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the impact on (a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 24 Clewborough Drive.

Reasons

3. The existing property on the appeal site is a two storey dwelling with attached flat roofed garage / utility set forward and to the side of the dwelling. It is of modern design with pitched roof sloping away from the road frontage, set back from the front boundary, which is marked by a tall laurel hedge, some 2 metres in height. The garage on the appeal site is attached to the garage and side extension of the neighbouring property to the south-west, a bungalow. There are a number of mature trees within and beyond the large rear garden area.

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site lies within the Hedged Estate Character Area as identified in the Council's Western Urban Area Character SPD (2012) (WUAC). These areas tend to be located on the edges of the Wooded Hills Character Area and have a green character. The WUAC identifies the hall marks of this post war character area as generous plots accommodating detached dwellings and enclosure of the street scene with hedges and street trees. Guiding principles for the area within the WUAC include that particular regard should be paid to buildings to be set in spacious, regular plots which provide for space between and around buildings which allows for the maintenance of the verdant character.

5. The Council's Residential Design Guide SPD (2017) (RDG) also contains guidance within a number of Principles including that extensions will be expected to be subordinate to and consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the host building and in respect of side extensions, that they should not erode the character of the street scene.
6. Clewborough Drive displays most of the identified hall marks of the character area and the appeal site itself is a large plot with frontage enclosed by hedging and trees. The proposed two storey extension would replace the existing garage to the side / front of the dwelling, extending almost right up to the boundary and continue along the side boundary and beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The depth of the proposed extension along this boundary would be substantial extending well beyond the rear of the garage on the adjoining property and its overall mass would be larger than that of the two-storey element of the host dwelling.
7. Whilst the appeal site is of a reasonably generous size, the proposed extension would result in the dwelling appearing to fill almost the whole width of the plot. Furthermore, given its overall scale, it would appear disproportionately large in relation to the host property, exacerbated by the overall depth including substantial front extension incorporating a wide front gable and depth of side extension. These elements would be readily seen within the street scene, in particular from the end of Azalea Way, and despite the front boundary screening and set back distance, would appear as an overly dominant addition resulting in the dwelling appearing cramped within its plot. This would in turn detract from the spacious and verdant character of the area.
8. The Appellant has referred to other properties within the area that have been recently extended and I saw that some properties near to the site appeared to have been extended to the front with relatively large additions. Other properties towards the eastern end of the road also looked to have been the subject of extensions of somewhat similar design and used varied external materials. However, whilst noting that some used boarding and render on the external surfaces as proposed at the appeal site, which I consider would be acceptable, they otherwise appeared to be proportionate to their host dwelling and plot sizes and the spacious character of the area was maintained. This would not be the case with the appeal proposal.
9. With regard to the proposed garage, this would be sited in the front garden of the dwelling towards the site frontage. However, its overall height with low sloping roof would mean that it would not be particularly prominent within the street scene. In addition, it would be largely screened by the existing frontage hedge, albeit I note that it is proposed to be reduced to allow suitable visibility. I saw that within the area, indeed opposite the appeal site, there are similarly located garages within front garden areas, thus it would not be an incongruous addition. It would be acceptable within the street scene and would not detract from the verdant character of the area. It would thus comply with relevant policies and the guidance within the Council's SPDs.
10. However, I find that the proposed extensions would fail to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. They would thereby conflict with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2012) (CSDMPD) which seek to ensure that land is used efficiently within the context of its

surroundings and respects and enhances the quality of the environment, with particular regard to scale and massing, amongst other things. It would also fail to accord with principles PO1a, PO2 and PO3 of the WUAC and principles 10.1, 10.3 and 10.4 of the RDG.

11. With regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, I find that the proposal would not contribute to achieving well designed places and nor would it be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Living conditions

12. As noted above, the proposed side extension would extend a considerable distance beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling at No. 24 sited close to the boundary. Whilst the nearest element of that property was the garage, the rearward projection, height and position of the proposed extension would be such as to affect the outlook from the rear windows of that property. In addition, I saw on my site visit that there is a patio area immediately to the rear of the property which would be similarly adversely affected.
13. Whilst the proposed extension would be sited to the east of this adjoining dwelling and would therefore only be likely to affect the morning sunlight, the proposal would have an unacceptably overbearing effect resulting in an increased sense of enclosure.
14. The Appellant has suggested that permitted development rights would enable an extension to be built which would have 'a similar effect'. However, no lawful development certificate has been provided to clarify or confirm that claim and I therefore cannot give it any weight. However, I do agree that there would be no overlooking issue arising due to the position of the rear facing first floor balconies relative to this adjoining property and indeed a condition could be imposed to require a side screen if necessary.
15. Overall however, I find that the proposed extension would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 24 Clewborough Drive. It would thus fail to accord with CSDMPD Policies CP2 and DM9 which seek to ensure that development respects the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring property. It would also fail to accord with the principles of the WUAC and RDG which have similar aims and objectives.

Conclusions

16. I have found that the proposed extensions would be unacceptable for the reasons set out above. However, the proposed garage would comply with relevant development plan policies and guidance in respect of its impact on character and appearance. Whilst it is unclear what the parking standards should be, I note that the Council acknowledges that two off street parking spaces would be acceptable in respect of the scheme as a whole. However, given that the existing garage would remain, this could result in an over provision. In the circumstances therefore, I do not find that it would be appropriate to issue a split decision.
17. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR