
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by R J Marshall LLB DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/16/3163380

39a, Waverley Lane, Farnham, Surrey, GU9 8BH

- 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 Dr Judith Kurucz against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2016/1577, dated 27 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing garage/part dwelling and proposed extensions/alterations to provide a two storey chalet style dwelling with skylight windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Main issue

3. The appeal site is in an attractive low density residential suburb and fronts onto Waverley Lane. Dwellings in the vicinity of the site are mostly attractive and fairly substantial 2 storey houses, many screened to some degree by frontage hedges.
4. In this setting the dwelling on the appeal site is rather an anomaly, being a relatively small detached bungalow. The proposed development would result in a much larger dwelling on the site and one that would be markedly different in appearance. Given the size of other dwellings in the road the Council correctly has no objection to the proposed development in terms of its scale. The Council's concern lies with the appearance of the proposed development given the size and design of a dormer window proposed in the front elevation.
5. The proposed dormer would, in terms of distance from the side elevations, be sited centrally in the tall roof slope of the proposed building. Although set reasonably well down from the ridge line it would extend so far down the roof that it would bisect the eaves line of the dwelling. As such it would be of a design and scale that would make it appear a dominant and intrusive structure

- in the front roof slope. This would be to the detriment of the appearance of the property as a whole.
6. There is a tall hedge on the road frontage of the appeal site. However, even if this was to remain at its present height, which is not guaranteed, the proposed development with its dormer window would be seen down the driveway. Thus it would be readily apparent from the roadside. This would be so even given the degree to which the proposed dwelling would be set back from, and at a slightly lower level than, the road. Also given the lie of the land, and lower level hedges on an adjoining site, the roof of the proposed dwelling would be clearly seen from a nearby road junction. Thus the unattractive form of development proposed would detract from the character and appearance of the wider area.
 7. I have noted the appellant's reference to the percentage of the roof slope that would be taken up by the dormer window and an allegation that the site is larger than the Council says. However, this does not alter my views above. I have taken account also of other developments in the locality referred to by the appellant comprising some new housing and some dormer windows. However, what I saw in the main were well proportioned and attractive houses, and the few instances where this is not the case do not bear repetition. Nothing that I saw appeared as out of keeping as the proposed development.
 8. It is concluded that the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 which require new development to be of high quality design and not to detract from the visual quality of the area. There would also be conflict with Policy TD1 of an emerging pre-submission draft Local Plan and Policy FNP1 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan which have broadly the same objectives as the aforementioned Policies.

Other matters

9. The proposed development would be sufficiently removed from a neighbouring house to the west for no unacceptable harm to arise though over-dominance or loss of light to the occupants of this property. With obscure glazed windows in the side elevation facing the neighbouring house no loss of privacy would arise. However, lack of harm in these respects does not make the proposal acceptable given the harm found on the main issue.
10. The proposed dwelling could provide better family accommodation than the current building and be more thermally efficient. However, such benefits would not outweigh the harm found.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

R J Marshall

INSPECTOR

