

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2017

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/17/3168613

Rosemary Cottage, Cobham Way, East Horsley, Leatherhead KT24 5BH

- 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 Colin Power against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref. 16/P/02212, dated 1 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is to demolish the side loggia and rear kitchen bay; replace the loggia with a living room extension; remove the roof and form complete new first floor accommodation with overhang (jetty) towards garage; erect single storey rear extension.
-

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 existing building.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is a C20th bungalow on a spacious plot forming part of a residential area that includes a number of detached two storey dwellings of varied design as well as other bungalows. I therefore see no reason in principle to preclude alterations and additions to form some first floor accommodation with consequential alterations to the roof form. This is especially as with East Horsley being a 'washed over' settlement in the Green Belt there is no objection to extensions to dwellings provided there is compliance with Policy H9 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 ('the Local Plan'). In addition, the officers' report does not object to the proposed single storey side extension and replacement side extension.
 4. Because of these factors the main issue as set out in paragraph 2 above is focused entirely on whether the scale and design of the first floor additions and roof alterations would be acceptable having regard to Local Plan Policy H9 and to Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 ('the Framework').
 5. The grounds of appeal argue that the roof extensions would appear as part of an original dwelling rather than appear as incongruous, and although the roof design would have 'visual interest' it would not harm the character and
-

appearance of the existing building. However, to my mind the extent of first floor accommodation would be too large for the existing building footprint, as indeed is illustrated by the projection of the substantial dormer in the south west roof plane and the somewhat contrived cantilevered extension on the north east elevation.

6. I do not consider that either of these extensions would sit comfortably with the main roof, which because of the increase in ridge height and disproportionately high apex would have a noticeably pyramidal appearance that would draw the eye as being to some degree incongruous. In addition, the front and rear elevations would be spoilt by the projections to each side, whilst both flank elevations would have an overly complex appearance that indicates a lack of coherence and cohesion in the design.
7. This is inevitable given that there would be too much first floor accommodation on a ground floor that with its proportions is in visual and layout terms much more suitable for subservient additions above eaves level more akin to a conversion to a chalet bungalow. I therefore disagree with the appellant's point that the roof extensions would appear as part of an original dwelling, as if they did there would not have been any reason for the Council to reasonably refuse permission.
8. Overall, I conclude that the appeal scheme would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling that would be in conflict with Local Plan Policy H9 and Sections 7 and 9 of the Framework relating to design and development in the Green Belt respectively. I have noted the reference in the grounds of appeal to other substantial extensions in East Horsley, some of which in my view are more successful than others, albeit I acknowledge that all were granted permission. However, be that as it may it does not alter my agreement with the Council that the scale and design of the alterations and additions in the case of Rosemary Cottage are not such as to warrant the scheme's approval.
9. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR