



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3321674

32 Milden Gardens, Frimley Green, Camberley GU16 6PU

- 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 Graham and Emma Kitchen against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0082/FFU, dated 25 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey side/rear extension, replacement of first floor dormer, alterations to garage roof, insertion of garage door and 2 x roof lights, and alterations to main roof to form gable end.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. During the determination of the application the description of development was amended by the council in order to incorporate all aspects requiring planning permission. I have therefore taken the description of development from the decision notice as it is more accurate.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.
4. Milden Gardens is a pleasant, post-war, suburban cul-de-sac of semi-detached and detached brick-built dwellings which are generally bungalows. At the site visit, I observed that a number of the existing dwellings had been extended and altered through the conversion of loft spaces and addition of box dormers, together with side and rear extensions.
5. The character of the street is spacious, partly as a result of the low-rise nature of the bungalows which are separated by driveways and/or rear pedestrian accesses. The distinctive design of hipped rooflines also contributes to this feeling of spaciousness. Most of the dwellings are set in good-sized plots with off street parking and front gardens set behind hedges and low walls.
6. No32 is a semi-detached bungalow which appears to have been subject to a small amount of enlargement. The proposals would result in the significant enlargement of both the ground and first floor accommodation. This would

- include the creation of a guest bedroom, snug and the reinstatement of a single garage (which had previously been converted to a bedroom).
7. I consider the substantial addition to the first floor would result in a roof design that would be at odds with the attached neighbouring dwelling. This would result in an imbalance in the roof design, where only one side is hipped. In relation to the other neighbour, I agree with the council that this would significantly erode the gap between them. Overall, the resultant roofline design would show a significant departure from the established character of dwellings in the street.
 8. Guiding Principles PC1, PC2 and PC4 of the Western Urban Area Character (WUAC) SPD (2012), seek to guide development and protect the character of this Post-War Council Estates Character Area.
 9. Further, Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012) (DP) and principles 10.3, 10.4 and 10.5 of the Residential Design Guide SPD (2017) all seek high quality development which reinforces local character and distinctiveness.
 10. I note that the appellant has provided examples of other dwellings within the street which have been subject to enlargement and extension. However, I do not agree that these are the same as, or even similar to these appeal proposals.
 11. To that end, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits and in light of the character and design of the neighbouring properties.
 12. I consider the appeal proposals, specifically at first floor level and in light of the proposed roof design, would result in harm to the character and appearance of area, contrary to Guiding Principles PC1, PC2 and PC4 of the Western Urban Area Character (WUAC) SPD (2012); Policy DM9 of the DP and principles 10.3, 10.4 and 10.5 of the SPD.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR