



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: 16th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3326684

111 London Road, Bagshot GU19 5DH

- 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 Deborah Mudway against the decision of the Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0250/FFU, dated 7 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear/infill extension, roof replacement and raising to provide first floor accommodation and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear/infill extension, roof replacement and raising to provide first floor accommodation and alterations to fenestration at 111 London Road, Bagshot GU19 5DH in accordance with the terms of the application, 23/0250/FFU, dated 7 March 2023, subject to the attached conditions schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is positioned behind No.109 London Road and accessed via Fry's Lane, a shingled access drive between Nos.109 and 117. Due to its position and single-storey form, the appeal property has a limited presence from London Road which is a busy 'A' road with a mixture of residential and retail/commercial premises.
4. The proposal would make a number of alterations to the property, but the Council's concerns are restricted to the first-floor element. To create the first floor the existing gabled section to the north-eastern end of the property would be increased in height. This is the section furthest from Fry's Lane and the land slopes down in that direction.
5. Given the increased height and scale it would become the main feature of the property. This would be counter to the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - *Residential Design Guide* which indicates that extensions need to be subordinate. Whilst the SPD provides helpful guidance as to what may be considered good design, this must also be considered alongside the individual circumstances of the site and the proposal.

6. The siting of the appeal property is not typical, and any upward extension will, by its nature, be a notable addition. No.111 has a sizeable plot and is surrounded by two-storey dwellings. Restricted to one end, the first-floor extension would not overly consume the existing property, with the visually prominent aspect towards Fry's Lane remaining the original bungalow.
7. In my view, this would not significantly alter the character of the section of the public bridleway which consists of the driveway serving the small cluster of residential properties. Beyond the appeal property, it becomes a non-vehicular route which slopes down, and views are limited by the enclosing vegetation. With a resultant ridge height of 7m, the property would not be excessively tall or obtrusive within the wider area. Views of the property from London Road along Fry's Lane are limited to the south-western end which is not affected by this proposal.
8. The external wall and roof materials are to match the existing property. The internal layout with bathrooms to the front echoes the ground floor arrangements and would ensure privacy to the adjacent rear garden to No.109a. Overall, I find that the extension has been designed to respond to the site's constraints and would integrate well with the existing property.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area or be intrusive to users of the bridleway. The height and form of the extension would not reflect specific guidance within the SPD but would accord with the general principles and Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document which seek high-quality design which respects local character.

Conditions

10. 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.
11. The Council has also suggested a condition restricting the first-floor windows to the front elevation which I agree is necessary to ensure privacy to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons set out the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

Condition Schedule

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; 2022/58/L01, 2022/58/S01, 2022/58/S02, 2022/58/P01 Rev A, 2022/58/P02 Rev A and 2022/58/L02.
3. The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extensions and alterations hereby approved shall match those of the existing dwelling.
4. The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first-floor windows in the front (southeast) elevation serving the bathroom and en-suite shall have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.