
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/16/3160410

28 Orchard House, The Greenwood, Guildford, Surrey GU1 2ND

- 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 Mark Harrington against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/P/00517, dated 10 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear and side extension at ground and first floor with small section adjacent to other half of semi-detached at ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is formed by a two storey, semi-detached property and its associated curtilage. The surrounding area is residential in character and contains a variety of two storey and single storey dwellings, some of which appear to have been previously extended.
 4. The pair sits at the end of a turning head and topography of The Greenwood slopes down toward the appeal site and Willow Lane to the rear. The properties on either side of the pair are single storey and No. 28 is set in from the side boundary with No. 29. Consequently there is a sense of spacious and openness to the side of the property that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, because of the topography and in combination with the alignment of the road, which curves around towards the turning head, the appeal property is also conspicuous and prominent within the street on the approach to it.
 5. Although the extension would be set back from the front elevation, the ridge of the roof would be only slightly set down from the ridge of the existing roof and the width of the proposal would be comparable to that of the existing dwelling. It would also introduce a large amount of additional roof slope and would be sited much closer to the side boundary with No. 29. To my mind, this would result in an unsympathetic and overly wide addition of built form on the side of the host property that would substantially change its character and appearance
-

when viewed from the street, resulting in an incongruous and discordant addition.

6. Furthermore, when viewed on the approach down The Greenwood the width of the proposal would substantially reduce the existing space to the side boundary with No. 29 to such a degree that it would also erode the current sense of openness and spaciousness and the contribution that this currently makes to the character and appearance of the area.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policies G5 and H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 ('LP') which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development respects the scale, height and proportions of the surrounding environment and has no unacceptable effect on the scale and character of the dwelling and the immediate surroundings.
8. Although the LP pre-dates the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') I find these policies are consistent with it. Accordingly, the proposal would also conflict with the design objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that extensions may well exist on other properties within the area and in particular, I have been referred to two extensions by the appellant¹. However, on the basis of the evidence submitted both proposals have been designed with much narrower side extensions and the majority of built form appears to be located to the rear. In my view, they are not therefore directly comparable to the proposal before me and neither these, or other extensions within the area alter my view in relation to the main issue or justify the harm that I have identified. In any event each case must be determined on its own merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole and the Framework. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR

¹ Appendices 5 and 6 of Kiely Planning Statement dated September 2016.