
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/16/3163897
32 Queen Eleanors Road, Guildford GU2 7SL

- 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 W Gong against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/P/01893, dated 20 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extension, new first floor and loft with 3 dormers and additional one parking space to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The documents submitted by the appellant include an amended front elevation drawing (GONG/PSE/09AP). However, I have decided that I am not able to accept this amended drawing for consideration as part of this appeal for the reasons I have set out in paragraph 7 below. I have proceeded to determine the appeal on the basis of the drawings considered by the Council as listed in its decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The properties along Queen Eleanors Road are a mixture of two storey and detached bungalows, although the two storey properties are in the majority. Whilst the Council has no objection in principle to the existing appeal property being developed into a two storey property, it has raised objection to the bulk and design of the proposal, particularly the proposed main roof and front gable projection.
 5. The angle of pitch of the roof to the front gable would be noticeably different to that of the main roof of the extended dwellinghouse. This front gable element would extend significantly forward of the remainder of the dwellinghouse and it would therefore be particularly prominent within the streetscene.
 6. In principle, with an appropriate design, such a front gable element protruding forward need not be unacceptable within the streetscene. However, in this
-

case the angle of pitch of its roof would appear at odds with and would have a discordant relationship with the main roof of the extended dwelling. This would be particularly so given that the angle of its pitch results in the roof of the front gable projection appearing as significantly more prominent than it would otherwise be with a reduced roof pitch. In my view, this would adversely affect the appearance of the dwelling. It would appear as a discordant element within the streetscene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

7. The appeal submission includes an amended front elevation drawing showing a lower roof pitch to match that of the main roof of the extended dwelling. Nevertheless, no other revised drawings have been provided of the resulting side elevations. These would be necessary as it appears to me that the overall height of the front gable projection would be lowered as a result of this amendment. The drawings before me would not therefore be consistent with each other. Furthermore, 'The Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals- England' advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought (Annexe M.2.1). I have not therefore accepted the amended drawing and have considered the appeal proposal based on those drawings listed by the Council in its decision notice. It is not clear to me from the information before me that the amended drawing in question was considered by the Council in its determination of the application and, in any case, the lack of related side elevations means that the drawings would be inconsistent.
8. The main roof of the proposed development includes a central flat roofed element. There are other similar flat roofed sections to existing two storey properties in the road and I do not consider that this would be particularly noticeable or detrimental to the appearance of the property in the streetscene. Nor do I consider that the pitch of the proposed main roof would be out of keeping with the roofs of other two storey properties in the road.
9. The first floor part of the extension to the side of the front gable projection adds to the overall bulk and massing of the resulting dwellinghouse. Whilst the overall size of the dwelling and its main roof would be larger than the majority of other properties, it would be similar in design and massing to some other properties including that allowed at appeal at 27 Queen Eleanors Road. The appeal Inspector noted that the extended dwellinghouse at No.27 would not appear as being unduly large or out of scale¹. In that case I note that the existing dwelling was already two storey and that the proposed extension did not increase the height and form of the roof. However, with the exception of the front gable projection proposed in the current appeal, the appearance of the resulting dwelling and its effect on the streetscene appears to be broadly similar to the current proposal at No. 32.
10. Whilst I find no harm to result from the main roof and overall massing of the extended dwelling, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above in relation to the design of the roof of the front gable projection. That harm is the overriding consideration.

¹ APP/Y3615/D/10/2125302

11. At my site visit I viewed other extended properties in the area including those highlighted in the appellant's appeal statement. However, I do not consider that these other extensions provide justification for allowing the current proposal which I have considered on its individual merits finding the harm identified above.
12. I find that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to the design aims of saved policy H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR