
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Richard S Jones BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/16/3158828

19 Stocton Road, Guildford, Surrey GU1 1HH

- 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 J Kitcat against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/P/01047, dated 16 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a "single storey rear extension – eaves raised 1200mm – length of extension reduced following previous refusal – resubmission."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 21 Stocton Road, with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. Both the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring property at No 21 are detached dwellings situated in close proximity to each other. The rear building line at two storey level is roughly the same. However, at ground floor level the depth of the appeal dwelling is significantly greater with a relatively long single storey element and conservatory extension.
 4. I appreciate that efforts have been made to overcome the Council's concerns relating to a previously refused scheme and in this regard the main depth of the extension has been reduced to approximately 4m. Nevertheless, the extension would run to the full width of the dwelling and would significantly raise the eaves level from that of the existing, thereby adding material bulk to the existing built form adjacent to the boundary with No 21.
 5. In doing so, this would create a considerable extent of unrelieved side elevation which would dominate the outlook from the rear ground floor patio doors and garden area of No 21 in a manner which would be overbearing and oppressive and materially worse than the existing situation.
 6. Whilst the appellant contends that the appeal proposal was refused without taking into account the reduction in size from the first application, this is not borne out by the Council's report which recognises that the scheme has been significantly reduced. I appreciate that the Council may have used an incorrect
-

dimension within the reason for refusal, but this has not influenced my decision making on this matter.

7. The appellant has stated that the bulk of the extension would be less than a 30% increase on the existing roof. However, in the particular circumstances of this case, such an increase would be significant and despite being reduced in length, would result in the loss of light at the rear of No 21. This adds to my main concern relating to the adverse effect on the outlook from that property.
8. I appreciate that the occupants of No 21 have written in support of the application but in my view the proposal would be harmful to the their living conditions and that of any future occupants of that property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved Policy G1 (3) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, which seeks to protect the amenities enjoyed by occupants of buildings from unneighbourly development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard S Jones

Inspector