



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: 19 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3324409

2 Tremayne Walk, Camberley, GU15 1AH

- 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 Ms Claudia Wentworth against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0393/FFU, dated 12 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey front extension plus porch with fenestration additions and landscaping alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.
3. Tremayne Walk is a modern suburban cul-de-sac located off Cumberland Road which provides a main road through the wider housing estate. The character of Tremayne Walk is suburban and spacious, which is enhanced by sloping nature of the area, unenclosed side and front gardens and the mature landscaping which provides a verdant, open and pleasant setting for the homes which line both Tremayne Walk and Cumberland Road.
4. The appeal property (No2) is a semi-detached dwelling, situated at the entrance to Tremayne Walk where it joins Cumberland Road. This puts it in a highly visible location. It is 'mirrored' by a very similar dwelling on the other side of Tremayne Walk. As part of the site visit, I observed that a number of dwellings within Tremayne Walk had been extended and altered. I also note that the appellant in their submission cites the adjoining No20 Cumberland Road having been extended. I observed this at the site visit. However, none of these dwellings have the same level of visibility as No2 and I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
5. I note that the officer report explains what the council consider to be the principal elevation (the elevation with the front door access from Tremayne Walk) and I agree. The proposals would result in an approximate doubling of the mass of the existing dwelling, adding an additional bedroom, bathroom and dressing room on the first floor and facilitating a larger kitchen, additional sitting room and study on the ground floor. The dwelling currently has a

- modest, enclosed rear garden, with a large side/front garden and single garage and driveway.
6. The appeal site is located within a character area identified in the Western Urban Area Character SPD (2012) and described as a 'Contemporary Paved Estate'. Guiding principles CP1 and CP2 of the Western Urban Area Character SPD (2012) sets out that particular attention should be paid to maintaining open front gardens and existing gaps between buildings, and that proposals that would erode the existing gaps that contribute to openness will be resisted.
 7. Further, Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012) (DP) and principles 10.1 and 10.2 of the Residential Design Guide SPD (2017) all seek to ensure high quality development which reinforces local character and distinctiveness. Specifically, principles 10.1 and 10.2 set out that if a proposed extension to a principal elevation is overbearing or is over dominant in the street scene, it will be resisted.
 8. I have seen from the submitted drawings that the appellant has sought to marginally reduce the ridge height of the proposed extension below that of the host dwelling. However, given the far greater drop in floor levels between the host dwelling and proposed extension, it is clear to me that this reduction would not appear subservient from the street.
 9. Indeed, I consider the overall effect of the extension would add significantly to the overall bulk of the house, which would appear overbearing within the street scene. The loss of the spaciousness would also be harmful to the character of the area, in my view.
 10. I also note that the proposed extension would have a hipped roof design, reflecting similar designs nearby, and that the appellant has included similar facing materials to those used in the host dwelling. However, I do not consider that these aspects would overcome the harm to character and appearance that would arise from the sheer scale of the proposal.
 11. In terms of the street scene, I consider there would be some limited harm arising from the resulting 'imbalance' between the appeal proposals and the dwelling directly opposite No2 on Tremayne Walk, where the two dwellings would no longer 'mirror' one another.
 12. The appellant states that the existing 'setback' from the edge of the street of 15m would reduce to 6.2m (if the appeal proposals were to be allowed) and whilst this is a factor in assessing the proposals against the adopted policy and guidance cited in the decision notice, the loss of spaciousness is more than simply an exercise in assessing such measurements.
 13. I have considered the harm associated with the scale of the proposals; the loss of spaciousness and existing 'gaps' as well as considering the harm to character and appearance overall. When measured against the efforts the appellant has gone to in terms of the use of sympathetic materials, roof design and their contention that there would still be sufficient separation, I have concluded that the harm to character and appearance would not be overcome.
 14. I therefore consider the appeal proposals would result in harm to the character and appearance of area, contrary to Guiding Principles CP1 and CP2 of the DP; Policy DM9 of the DP and principles 10.1 and 10.2 of the SPD.

Conclusions

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

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR