



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by **David Murray** BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/25/3359712

64 Henley Drive, Frimley Green, CAMBERLEY, GU16 6NF

- 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 Edward Brown against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0804/FFU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor side extension, ground floor front porch, internal alterations and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a detached property which is situated in a residential area of similar properties of a varying designs. The host property is two-storey with what was originally a single storey double garage to the side but this has now been converted into accommodation. The house has elevations in brickwork and this is set in a timber frame on the front elevation. It is proposed to build a first floor over the single storey extension (original garage) to form an additional bedroom with ensuite and walk-in dressing room. The proposal includes various permutations of different designs with minor changes to the structure being set-back or set-in and slightly reduced in depth.

Character and appearance

4. The houses that make up the existing local character are quite large but they have a relatively spacious appearance in the street scene mostly due to the gaps between them. The general form of the properties having single storey pitched roof garages at the side, or where the garages are sited in a forward position as per the adjacent one at no. 66, contributes to the feeling of spaciousness. These gaps also allow views through to the trees to the rear giving a verdant quality to the street scene. Such gaps are also recognised as important parts of the

character of the area as set out in Guiding Principles PO1 (a), PO2 and PO3 of the Council's Western Urban Area character SPD.

5. I am concerned that building a first floor above the existing structure would diminish the visual gap to the adjacent property No. 62 and would lead to an almost continuous bulk of building work along the frontage. This 'terracing effect' would be virtually the same whatever option on the design of the proposal is used. The staggered building line of properties on the northern side of Henley Drive would limit the views of the degree of built frontage from the east but it would be prominent in views from opposite the site and when approaching from the south and west.
6. At the site visit I did notice a few other properties along the same street which appeared to have new side extensions but in the main these involved a more substantial gap with the immediately adjacent property and the overall character of the street scene was maintained.
7. Overall I find that the scale, position and massing of the proposed first floor addition and its proximity to the side boundary of the site would result in a dominating spread of building bulk across the site, and remove the visual gap between properties, which would harm the character and appearance of the local street scene. As such the proposal would conflict with the design principle set out in Policy DM9 of the Council's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies as it would not respect or enhance the local environment. The proposal would also conflict with the detailed guidance in the Character SPD mentioned above which is a material consideration.

Effect on living conditions

8. This issue is concerned with the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property No.62. In assessing this I have had regard to the general guidance in the Council's Residential Design Guide SPD.
9. The host property is set back on a stagger with No, 62 and the appellant accepts that the present single storey extension breaches a 45° angle measured from rear facing windows of No.62. The existing juxtaposition therefore causes some impact in terms of loss of light to No.62 but this physical relationship appears long standing. However, the proposed first floor would increase this impact to a noticeable degree. It would be possible to have this first floor element set back 800mm to maintain a 45° splay but there would still be a large building mass very close to the boundary and above the party boundary fence. I also noticed at the time of my visit in early afternoon that the proposed first floor addition would greatly overshadow the amenity area and rear facing windows of No. 62.
10. Overall I find that given the height and proximity to the party boundary of the site the proposed first floor addition would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.62 by being overbearing and it would cause a loss of light/sunshine. As such the proposal would conflict with part (iii) of Policy DM9.

Planning Balance

11. On the main issues I have found that the scale and bulk of the proposed first floor additions across the site would result in a 'terracing' effect by significantly reducing the present visual gap between the properties and would be harmful to the street

scene. The bulk of additional building and its proximity to the party boundary would also harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent property at No. 62. These adverse effects mean the proposal conflicts with the provisions of the relevant Policy DM9.

12. This conflict with the development plan has to be balanced with other considerations.
13. I acknowledge that there would be some economic benefit associated with the proposal particularly at the construction stage, but this benefit would be relatively limited and short term. Overall, the benefits put forward in support of the development as other considerations, do not outweigh the local adverse effects that I have identified or the conflict with the development plan. This indicates that the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR