

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/17/3175108

43 West Avenue, Farnham GU9 0RB

- 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 and Mrs D Cimino against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2016/2503, dated 22 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side/front extension incorporating a garage. First floor rear extension. Amendment of application ref WA/2016/1700.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey dwelling, with a single storey rear addition, which it is situated within a predominately residential area. Within the surrounding area, including fronting West Avenue, there are examples of the same design of dwelling as the property. However, there are some variations in dwelling types and designs, including semi-detached properties, but the majority of the dwellings possess hipped roofs. Some dwellings have been altered by the addition of single and 2-storey side and rear extensions and there are also examples of unsympathetic alterations to the roofs, including large dormers within rear roof slopes and hip to gable roof extensions.
 4. The proposed development includes a predominantly single storey side addition, a front porch, a first floor extension above the existing rear addition and alterations to the roof, including a partial increase in the property's ridge height and a hip to gable roof extension. The appeal scheme seeks to address the Council's objections to a previous proposal for alterations to the property.
-

Given the differences between the design of the previous and current proposals, the appeal scheme has been assessed on its own planning circumstances.

5. When assessed in isolation, the proposed porch and side extension, together with the modest addition at first floor level to accommodate a staircase, would not detract from the character and appearance of either the host property or the streetscene. There are already examples within the surrounding area of garages being sited within the gaps between dwellings.
6. There are examples of 2-storey rear extensions, including additions to similarly designed dwellings as the appeal property, within the surrounding area. These extensions can be seen from neighbouring gardens and roads such as West Close and North Avenue. However, these extensions are subservient to the host dwelling with lower roofs and they generally respect the existing hipped roof form.
7. The proposed first floor extension would result in a bulky gabled roof form which would fail to visually integrate with the property but, instead, would be unsympathetic to its existing character and appearance, in particular because of the loss of the hipped roof form. The unsympathetic extension to the rear of the property would be noticeable from other gardens and both North Avenue and West Close. This element of the appeal scheme would fail to complement the design and appearance of similarly designed and subsequently altered dwellings within the surrounding area
8. The appearance of the unsympathetic rear extension and conspicuous alteration to the existing roof form would be accentuated by the proposed increase in only part of the ridge height of the property and the awkward visual relationship between the 2 parts of the roof. By reason of the gaps between the property and neighbouring dwellings, the difference in ridge height between the proposed and the original parts of the roof would be noticeable from West Avenue.
9. Account has been taken of the appellants' evidence concerning variations in roof levels associated with some Arts and Crafts style properties and the Councils *Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* which requires extensions to be subservient. However, these matters do not alter the assessment which has been made. Indeed, together the design of the proposed first floor extension and associated partial increase in the ridge height of the property would not amount to a subservient addition to the property.
10. When assessed as a whole, the design and bulk of the appeal scheme would result in an unsympathetic alteration to the property which would be detrimental to the wider character and appearance of the surrounding area. Although I do not share the Council's specific concerns about the relationship

between different external materials, this matter is outweighed by the harm which has been identified.

11. For the reasons given, it is therefore concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan. Amongst other matters, these policies require development to be of a high quality which respects local distinctiveness and are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's core principle of securing high quality design.
12. The proposed development would also conflict with Policy FNP16 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2016 for extensions to fit unobtrusively with the existing building. Although the Neighbourhood Plan has yet to be made or adopted, significant weight can be given to the plan because it has been the subject of a referendum and the legal challenge¹ to its adoption has failed.
13. The Council referred to Policy TD1 of the Waverley Borough Draft Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2016 but this plan has yet to be adopted and, in any event, this policy does not add materially to the considerations of the adopted development plan policies.

Other Matters

14. The appellants have identified that there is an approved scheme at 41 West Avenue but the details of this neighbouring proposal have not been provided for me to be able to make an assessment about whether there are any implications for the proposed development. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR

¹ R (on the Application of Bewley Homes & Others) v Waverley Borough Council & Another