

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Jim Metcalf BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 09 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/16/3158824

112 Greenfield Road, Farnham, GU9 8TQ

- 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 & Mrs Gregory against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2016/1404, dated 7 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a single storey porch at front and the removal of a sun-room and the addition of two storey and one storey extensions at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the removal of a sun-room and the addition of two storey and one storey extensions at rear.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the addition of single storey porch at front and planning permission is granted for the addition of single storey porch at front at 112 Greenfield Road, Farnham, GU9 8TQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2016/1404, dated 7 July 2016, and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:- 245_SL/01; 245_AE/01; 245_AE/02; 245_DP01; 245_DP/02.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the living conditions of residents at No 114 Greenfield Road, with regard to outlook.
-

Reasons

4. No 112 Greenfield Road is a semi-detached house sat in a row of similar properties. Long gardens rise up behind the houses. At the front of the house the porch would be suitably designed and similar to others along the street. The Council do not object to the porch. I agree with this conclusion.
5. At the side and rear a part single/part two storey extension would wrap round the corner of the house. The two storey side wall of the extension would be about 0.8m from the boundary with the house next door, No 114 Greenfield Road. The extension would project about 4.9m from the main rear wall of the house.
6. The Council have adopted a Supplementary Planning Document, 'Residential Extensions' (SPD). SPD seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that extensions are not large and visually dominating, such that they would undermine the amenity of neighbours. To address this issue SPD explains that two storey rear extensions should be at least 3m from the boundary with a neighbouring property and should not exceed 4m in depth.
7. The two storey part of the extension would be closer to No 114 Greenfield Road, and extend further into the garden than the guidance in SPD allows. Because of its position and height it would be prominent when seen from the neighbouring house. This would be evident from within a conservatory and from the area outside at the rear of the house. The effect of the side wall of the extension on the outlook next door would be mitigated to a degree by the difference in levels, the appeal property is about 0.5m lower than the neighbour, by a shed in the neighbour's garden and by a fence and vegetation on the boundary between the properties. However, these circumstances do not significantly screen the wall, nor reduce its overbearing effect, from the outlook of the neighbours.
8. There are other two storey extensions at the rear of other houses in the row, including one at No 108 Greenfield Road. I have not been provided with the planning history of these extensions but in any event my assessment is based entirely on the situation at No 112 Greenfield Road and its relationship with the house next door. I have also noted that Farnham Town Council have no objections to the work.
9. However, none of these other matters outweigh my concerns that the extension, because of its position and depth, would significantly detract from the living conditions of residents at No 114 Greenfield Road, with regard to outlook, contrary to Policies D1 & D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (LP) and SPD. Together the two LP Policies state that development will not be permitted where it would result in material detriment to the environment and that it should not, amongst other things, significantly harm the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties by way of an overbearing appearance.
10. The Council find that the porch would be acceptable in relation to the character of the existing building and the street scene, in compliance with LP Policies. I agree with this analysis. The porch would be physically and functionally separate from the rear extension. Consequently, I propose to issue a split decision, upholding that part of the appeal relating to the porch.

11. In addition to the standard condition that limits the time available for development to commence I have imposed conditions to ensure that the porch is built in accordance with the approved plans with materials to match those on the existing house, to give the work a satisfactory appearance when seen from the street.

Jim Metcalf

INSPECTOR