

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 05 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/16/3159578

6 North Side, The Cardinals, Tongham, Surrey GU10 1EA

- 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 Mr V Alonso against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref. 16/P/01329, dated 7 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension; a single storey rear extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that No. 6 is one half of a semi-detached pair of dwellings with No. 5 and that there are pairs of the same design on either side at Nos. 3 & 4 and 7 & 8 respectively. The simple traditional design form of the three semi-detached pairs together with the balance and symmetry within each pair to my mind makes a positive contribution to the street scene, the side extension to No. 7 notwithstanding.
 4. Whilst I acknowledge that the principle of extensions to the appeal dwelling is likely to be acceptable, it seems to me that in order to maintain the architectural integrity of the original building and the aesthetic merits of this more spacious part of the North Side street scene these should be of a scale and form that would not draw the eye as being noticeably different and thereby perceived as harmful.
 5. In my assessment the current proposals fail in this respect. Not only would the two-storey side extension fail to be subservient to the host dwelling, the wrap around form of the original footprint both at the front and rear would to all intents and purposes dominate the building's character and appearance.
 6. The grounds of appeal refer to a fall back position in respect of the potential for extensions permitted development. However, whilst I acknowledge that the additional floorspace achieved through this procedure would be substantial,
-

especially to the rear, I do not consider that it would have the adverse effect on the semi-detached pair and the street scene that would be the result of the appeal scheme.

7. Nor do I regard these alternative proposals as justifying a scheme which, contrary to the arguments in the grounds of appeal, would be in clear conflict with Policies G5 and H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003; the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Residential Extensions 2003 and Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
8. I have taken into account all the other matters raised for the appellant, but as in my view the proposals would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider street scene, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR