



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3325428

160 Ambleside Road, Lightwater, Surrey GU18 5UW

- 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 Woods against the decision of the Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0261/FFU, dated 10 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single, part two storey front, rear and side extensions plus a part garage conversion into habitable accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for part single, part two storey front, rear and side extensions plus a part garage conversion into habitable accommodation at 160 Ambleside Road, Lightwater, Surrey GU18 5UW in accordance with the terms of the application, 23/0261/FFU, dated 15 May 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions: -
 - 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; 735.LOC, 735.BLO, 735.PRO, 735.01, 735.02, 735.03, and 735.04.
 - 3 The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extensions and alterations hereby approved shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

Reasons

3. No.160 is a detached chalet bungalow located on the northern side of Ambleside Road. The long road has a suburban character with the properties set back and trees adjacent to the road. The properties are a mixture of bungalows and houses which vary in style and scale with many benefitting from extensions and substantial alterations. The appeal property and its neighbour, No.162, are of the same design with flat roof dormer windows to the front and rear and are relatively modest in scale compared to others along Ambleside Road.

4. The scale and depth of the proposed extensions are limited. The gable projection would have a wide span but there would be no increase in the overall height of the property and the pitched form would maintain space to the side of the property at first floor level.
5. Gable ends to the road are a characteristic feature of the area, including within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site with the neighbour to the other side (No.158) orientated with its flank to the road and the larger house at No.164 has a two-storey gabled projection to the front elevation. As such, while the proposed gable feature would notably alter the appearance of the appeal property it would integrate well with the local character and would not be unduly prominent in the street scene. Given the built context I do not find that the increase in massing would be out of keeping or that there would be a loss of space around the property. The slope of the roof helps to create a defined gap and the ridge line is to be set further away from the eastern boundary.
6. The Council has raised no concerns with the other parts of the proposal which include a porch and a small extension to the western side of the property, and I have no reason to disagree.
7. Overall, I find that the proposed extensions would be appropriate for the property and would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the development would accord with policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document, principle B3 of the Lightwater Village Design Statement and the overall aims of the Residential Design Guide, which together and amongst other things, seek high-quality design which respects local character.

Other Matters

8. Whilst I note the objections from the neighbours, based on my observations I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in any harm to their living conditions, a finding that is supported by the Council who have not raised this as an issue.

Conditions

9. Conditions are necessary in the interests of compliance with statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and certainty in relation to the plans. In the interest of the appearance of the property and the character of the area, it is also necessary to secure the external materials to match the host property.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR