



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025 by T Mansfield

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/24/3351561

34 Bayfield Avenue, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 8TU

- 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 Tom Clare against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0389/FFU.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side and rear extension, single storey front extension and adaptations, and associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property belongs to an area defined by the Council as a Post War Open Estate. Whilst there are other house types present nearby, this part of the estate is made up of detached and link-detached properties that share features of post war architectural design including proportions and materials. Key to the character of this area is the prominence of the gable roof at the front of properties, which creates a visual relationship between dwellings and contributes to a distinctive sense of place for the area.
5. Where there have been extensions made to roofs in the area, these sit either separately from the gable, as was the case in the unimplemented permission for 4 Overdale Rise, or within the gable end, as can be seen at 31 and 33 Bayfield Avenue. Most, however, have hipped roofs to the side. This ensures that side extensions do not detract from that the characteristic prominence of the gable end.
6. Many properties in the area have gaps at first floor level above the garage, which contribute to the area having an open and spacious feel. This feature is particularly important for properties with linked garages, as maintenance of these gaps prevents the creation of a terracing effect. However, at properties whose garages are not linked to neighbours, there have been numerous side extensions that have

reduced gaps at first floor level. As a result, gaps at these properties make a lesser contribution to the character of the area.

7. At the appeal property, the proposed side extension would reduce much of the gap at first floor level above the property's garage, however it is not linked to neighbouring dwellings. As the extension would not extend beyond the footprint of the garage, a sufficient gap for access and servicing between the appeal site and 36 Bayfield Avenue would remain, and this would also retain a degree of visual separation between the two properties. The proposed side extension would therefore fit into the pattern of local development in this respect.
8. At the rear of the dwelling, the proposed hipped roof would overlap the existing gable. Although this design would fail to respect the existing gabling or reflect the post war architectural design of the property, the rear roof would not be visible from the street. Furthermore, I have been pointed to other examples of rear hipped roofs in the area that were approved by the Council. For this reason, the rear hipped roof would not be out of keeping with the pattern of development in the area and as such would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposed side extension would have a gable roof that would be neither separated from nor within the existing gable end, but rather it would be unsympathetically connected by sticking out of the existing roof such that the gables would overlap. The design of this smaller gable roof would therefore create an awkward and contrived relationship with the main roof and would detract from the prominence of the distinctive main gable. This element of the proposal would be clearly visible from public viewpoints. The proposed depth of the side extension, almost level with the front elevation of the property, would make this unsympathetic design stand out even more in the street scene. For these reasons, the proposed roof design over the first-floor side extension would be significantly harmful in its failure to respect and enhance the locally distinctive character and appearance of the area.
10. Of the examples in the nearby area provided to me, none display a comparable design to the proposed offshoot gable, with most being set back and with a clearly subservient roof that does not compete with the main gable feature. Therefore, I give these limited weight, and they do not justify the design before me.
11. The painted render proposed to be used on the extensions at first floor level is a material that is not seen in the immediate area. Properties in the Post War Open Estate typically have a full brick work façade, with some having coloured hanging tile at first floor level. Painted render would not therefore reflect the post war architectural design of the area and would make the proposed side extension stand out on the street scene even more. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, however this harm could be resolved through conditions to agree more appropriate materials, were the remainder of the proposal acceptable.
12. Whilst I appreciate that the appellant would be willing to revise elements of their design, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. Any material changes to the scheme would instead require the submission of a new planning application to allow any interested parties the opportunity to comment on changes.
13. Consequently, for the reasons above, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Borough Council Core Strategy &

Development Management Policies 2011-2028 (adopted 2012) insofar as it seeks to achieve high quality design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of both the existing building and the area.

14. The proposed development also fails to comply with Principles 10.1, 10.3 and 10.4 of the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide (2017) and P01 and P03 of the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012) insofar as they seek to achieve sympathetic design that does not erode the character of the local area, and expect development to reflect post war architectural design.

Other Matters

15. I acknowledge the appellant's comments expressing their surprise at the refusal of their planning application after they received positive pre-application advice from the Council. However, it is important to note that pre-application advice is not binding and as such I have had regard to the final decision issued by the Council when considering this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Mansfield

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR