



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by Robert Naylor BSc (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3323011

12 Warwick Close, Camberley, Surrey GU15 1ES

- 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 Bureiko against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1260/FFU, dated 6 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of garage and carport, single storey front, part two storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address in the banner heading above has been taken from the application form, albeit that the reference to Surrey has been made after Camberley rather than preceding as shown on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area with specific regard to the Hedged Estates Character Area (HECA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in the HECA as designated in the Surrey Heath Development Framework 2006-2028: Western Urban Area Character (WUAC) Supplementary Planning Document. The HECA identifies the area as containing generous plots accommodating detached dwellings with an enclosure of the street scene as a hall mark of the character. It identifies that the regularly shaped plots and roads, along with the hedges, create a slightly formal appearance in the street scene, further stating that the regular pattern of development allows buildings to be well-spaced.
5. Warwick Close is a tucked away cul-de-sac in a relatively secluded location, with well-established trees along both the street scene and rear gardens. The surrounding area has a pleasant, verdant feel, with Warwick Close having a pronounced rhythm to the street scene with the properties regularly spaced and sitting well within their plots. Each property has a centrally positioned gabled entrance providing a grand focal point and emphasises the symmetrical appearance of the main dwelling. Whilst there are single storey additions and garages on flank elevations, which elongates the footprint of the properties, their single storey and subservient nature is an important factor in maintaining

the gaps and permeability between the properties, adding to the spatial feel. It is this permeability which contributes to the area's spatial nature and is an important factor of the generously sized plots in defining the character of the area.

6. The appeal site is located at the end of the cul-de-sac with limited views, nevertheless, it forms part of the overall rhythm and pattern of development. Taken in isolation the proposal is well-designed and appears as a logical continuation of the property. However, its overall scale and bulk, provide a significant increase in the mass of development which would enclose the important gap between the host property and the neighbouring unit at No 10 Warwick Close. Whilst the articulated frontage seeks to break up the mass of the proposal, the significant reduction in the separation distance between the buildings, particularly at the upper floor level, would detrimentally reduce visual permeability.
7. The appellant draws my attention to other examples in Warwick Close which exhibit large, hipped roof slopes between properties, notably between Nos 3 and 5. Whilst it is acknowledged that the roof treatment is higher than others in the road, it is still single storey in appearance, maintaining the gap at upper floor level and providing a subservient feel, unlike the larger appeal proposal which would appear at odds with the more spread-out rhythm and character of the area. Nevertheless, this limited example does not provide an overriding influence over the character of the area or street scene.
8. The appellant also draws my attention to other examples¹ which highlight inconsistency in the application of policy. I have only been supplied with limited details in respect to these examples, however I note that both examples are located some distance from the appeal site, and within different character areas as designated in the WUAC. As such, these examples would have little influence over the character and appearance of the HECA and are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on all the evidence presented.
9. Overall, the proposed development would not respect or enhance the special and distinctive qualities of the HECA given the extensive form of development which would be at odds with the spacious character, and thus would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011-2028, adopted February 2012, which among other things require development to be of a high quality and to respect and enhance local character. The proposal would also fail to comply with advice contained within the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, adopted September 2017 and the WUCA Supplementary Planning Document, which amongst other things, collectively seek to secure high quality development in the Borough without compromising local character, the environment or the appearance. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it requires a high standard of design and the National Design Guide in regard to responding to existing local character and identity.

¹ Surrey Heath Planning Ref: 20/0955/FFU and PINS Ref: APP/D3640/D/20/3265629

Other Matters

10. The appellant also highlights that there would be no impact as a result of the proposal on the existing trees, nor would there be negative impacts on the living conditions of other nearby residents. Nevertheless, neither of these matters are in dispute, and in any case would be neutral in the planning balance, and thus would not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified above.

Conclusion

11. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations to indicate that my decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Naylor

INSPECTOR