



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2025

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/24/3350785

1 Hermitage Close, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey GU16 8LP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Smith against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0419/FFU.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part single, part two-storey side and rear extension, following removal of existing chimney, new front porch area, internal alterations and changes to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a linked-detached house which has been extended to both sides. It stands on a corner plot within the Council's Post War Open Estate Housing Character Area. This area can be characterised as containing dwellings of the same age and of similar architectural style with open boundaries to the front.
4. Although I have not been provided with their details, I note that there is an extensive planning history of proposals for similar extensions to that which is before me. These include a 2023 dismissed appeal decision.
5. In this Decision I have had regard to Policies DM9 and DM11 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CSDMP) and guidance within the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (RDG). In summary and of relevance to this appeal proposal, these policies and guidance require high quality design that respects and positively contributes to the character and quality of the surrounding area. The guiding principles in the Council's Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document (WUAC) have also been taken into account. These include the need to maintain space between and around buildings and avoiding the creation of terracing effects. Of particular relevance to this appeal, this includes maintaining side gardens and first floor level gaps between the side elevations of buildings.

6. As noted by the previous Inspector, the Hermitage Close street scene around the appeal site consists of individual dwellings that have been extended. There is no longer any consistency in the spacing between dwellings, including at the nearby Nos 3 and 5 where the two-storey elements are close together. However, none are so close as to create a terracing effect.
7. The first floor extension element of the proposal would be set back 1m from the front elevation and set in 1m from the side boundary. It would be lower than the main roof of the house, thereby appearing subservient. A sufficient gap would be retained between the appeal property and No 3 at first floor level to maintain spaciousness around the property and to avoid the creation of a terracing effect.
8. The use of a crown roof design as proposed would not in itself be objectionable in principle. However, the introduction of another, and different, roof style and pitch would appear incongruous and would be unsympathetic to the existing and proposed roofscape of the dwelling. Its overall design would also be out of keeping with neighbouring properties. The proposal thereby conflicts with RDG Principle 10.5 which requires sympathetic roof alterations that are subservient to the design of the main building and which do not undermine the street scene or local character.
9. Furthermore, in summary, RDG Principles 10.1, 10.3 and 10.4 expect extensions, including side extensions, to be subservient and consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building without eroding local character. The overall scale, massing and design of the proposed extensions, when considered alone or in combination with the existing extensions, could not reasonably be described as subservient to the original design of the main dwelling, or to the dwelling as it has already been extended. The proposal therefore conflicts with these design Principles.
10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would thereby conflict with CSDMP Policies DM9 and DM11 and would also fail to accord with the identified Principles of the WUAC and the RDG. Moreover, the proposed development would not contribute to achieving well designed places and would not be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment. This amounts to further conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR