



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by Mr Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/W/25/3358753

63 Le Marchant Road, CAMBERLEY, GU15 1HZ

- 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 S Lawrence against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0825/FFU.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a 3 bedroom detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and its effects on the living conditions of neighbours

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property sits at the junction of Le Marchant Road with the main Portsmouth Road. The appeal site has formed part of the rear garden of No 63 Le Marchant Road, although it currently appears to have been separated from it. The appeal site faces onto Portsmouth Road.
4. Le Marchant Road contains residential properties of post war age. The properties vary in styles and scale but they mainly consist of two-storey houses that stand within long plots and the built form creates a clearly defined street pattern. In contrast, the immediate context of the appeal site on Portsmouth Road is one where the road and the adjacent land is largely enclosed by landscape screening, with limited residential frontages and accesses. I agree with the Council and the previous Inspector when dismissing an appeal at this site (Ref: APP/D3640/W/21/3267684) when stating that this conveys a strong verdant character.
5. The frontage of the site is screened from Portsmouth Road by a dense evergreen hedge. There is an existing access at the far end of the site's frontage which gives some limited views of the garden and also views beyond of other landscaping. Again, I agree with the previous Inspector in concluding that the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the verdant setting of Portsmouth Road here.
6. Views of the proposed dwelling would be possible from the highway through the gap of the existing access. Whilst the mature trees on the frontage of the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order, the dense evergreen hedge is not protected from removal. The proposed dwelling would be sited closer to the

Portsmouth Road frontage than the previously dismissed appeal (by 2.2m according to the Council) and in my judgement would represent a prominent addition to the street-scene. Whilst I can see that some amendments have been made when compared to the previous appeal, I note that the footprint of the house would be larger and its siting closer to the road and also its particular roof design and different eaves levels would make it prominent, notwithstanding its reduction in height and the omission of the previously proposed garage. In addition, the proposal would stand within a plot that would be shallower than its neighbours. Therefore, whilst the overall size of the plot may be similar to neighbouring plots, its limited depth would mean that the building would be nearer to the road, increasing its prominence. The proposal would be sited significantly forward of the neighbouring house at No 89 Portsmouth Road a matter not mitigated by the presence of a single storey garage. This would therefore result in development that would be out of character with adjacent plots would appear cramped. I also consider that this effect would be heightened if the frontage hedge were to be removed.

7. I have taken account of the appellant's submissions relating to an appeal allowed for an extension further along Portsmouth Road adjacent to its junction with Glynswood (Ref: APP/D3640/D/21/3285520). However, I find that the character at that point is different from the location of the appeal site and the buildings on Portsmouth Road on the far side of Glynswood display an irregularity, which is not the same at the immediate context of the appeal site. I have also taken account of the proximity of the side elevation of the house on the opposite corner of Le Marchant Road to its plot boundary but consider that its context can be distinguished from the appeal site due to the lack of landscaped enclosure on that section of Portsmouth Road. Additionally, I have not been made aware of the planning circumstances which has given rise to that development.
8. Taking account of the above, the proposal is contrary to policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CS). The proposal would also fail to satisfy Guiding Principles of the WUAC and the Council's Residential Design Guide (2017) (RDG), as set out by the Council, which seek to ensure that development respects the shape and size of local plots.

Effects on Neighbours

9. The proposed side elevation of the house would be sited at its closest 11.6m from the rear elevation of No 63 and the appellant points out that the distance to the 'main' rear elevation would be 16m. the Council's normal requirement in such situations is for a minimum of 15m to be maintained and this is clearly breached by the proposal. I note that the height of the proposal has been reduced when compared to the previous appeal scheme, however I also note that its depth has been increased. I consider that the proposal would appear substantial and dominating when seen by the residents of No 63 and the proposal would unacceptably affect their outlook and enjoyment of their property. In this respect, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM9 of the CS.

Other Matters

10. The Council's second reason for refusal relates to the absence of a Planning Obligation which would secure measures to mitigate the proposal's effects on

Thames Basins Heaths Special Protection Area. The appellant has now submitted a Planning Obligation which would appear to satisfy the Council's concerns.

11. The Council acknowledges that it cannot demonstrate a 5 years supply of housing land and so indicates that the 'tilted balance' in paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged. Taking this into account I acknowledge that the proposal would make a contribution to housing supply within an already-developed area. However, as a single dwelling, that contribution would be of the lowest magnitude and I consider that the harmful effects that I have identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of allowing the appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR