



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2017

by K E Down MA (Oxon) MSc MRTPI MRSB

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

Decision date: 21st August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/17/3177411

12 Tangier Road, Guildford, GU1 2DE

- 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 & Mrs Peter Downie against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/P/00504, dated 3 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of a new two storey side extension with internal alterations. Side extension to front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new two storey side extension with internal alterations and a side extension to the front porch at 12 Tangier Road, Guildford, GU1 2DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/P/00504, dated 3 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos 16-1564-001 rev B, 16-1564-002 rev B, 16-1564-003 rev B, 16-1564-005 rev C, 16-1564-006 rev D, 16-1564-007 rev C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. There are two main issues, firstly, the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling; and secondly, the effect of the proposed side extension on the living conditions of occupiers of 10 Tangier Road with respect to outlook.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a large, two storey, detached house with an original coach house to the rear, set in a generous plot. It is of traditional design and typical of the Surrey vernacular. It has been extended in the past at single storey to the side and rear.
4. The dwelling is situated in a street that is characterised by large, detached dwellings on large plots. In the vicinity of the appeal dwelling, other houses are similar in architectural style to the appeal dwelling but different in design, contributing to a cohesive but pleasingly varied street scene. Many houses appear to have undergone extension and alteration.
5. The proposed extensions include a porch extension on the front elevation. The Council raises no objection to this and I agree that it would be acceptable. I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the proposed two storey side extension.
6. The proposed side extension would be above and behind the existing single storey garage and would link the back of the garage with the front of the coach house, infilling a courtyard to the side of the existing single storey rear extension. The first floor extension above the garage would have a hipped roof and front gable, echoing the style of the host dwelling. The roof would be noticeably lower than the main roof and the front elevation would be set back from the main façade, ensuring a subservient appearance when viewed from Tangier Road.
7. From the rear, the two storey extension would be substantially hidden behind the existing coach house and would have no material effect on the character or appearance of the dwelling when seen from the rear garden.
8. The side extension would result in a significant increase in the depth of the dwelling at first floor and this would be exaggerated by the infilling of the gap between the two storey dwelling and the two storey coach house. Nevertheless, the side elevation would retain interest through the incorporation of architectural detail and the depth of the original dwelling would remain apparent, owing to the step down in the eaves and ridge between the first floor extension and the two storey infill extension which would tie in with the coach house to the rear. Moreover, views of the side elevation would be restricted and not prominent either from the street or the main rear garden of 10 Tangier Road. I am therefore satisfied that the side elevation of the proposed side extension would not appear unduly bulky or out of scale.
9. The Council suggests that the increase in floor space would have a negative impact on the character of the building but as the dwelling is already a large house I am not convinced that the additional floorspace proposed would, in itself, have any material effect on character.
10. Overall, I am therefore satisfied that the proposed side extension would integrate well with and remain subordinate to the original dwelling. In consequence it is concluded on the first main issue that the proposed extensions would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling. There would thus be no conflict with Policies G5 and H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (LP) or with the National

Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which, taken together, expect amongst other things that extensions to dwellings will be well designed such that they have no adverse effect on the scale and character of the host building and respect the scale, height, proportions and materials of the surrounding environment such that they harmonise with it and reinforce the identity and character of the area.

11. Turning to the effect on living conditions of occupiers of 10 Tangier Road, the two storey infill extension would be located predominantly opposite a blank two storey section of side wall at No 10. It would extend a small distance behind the main rear façade. However, the single storey garden room that projects from the rear façade at No 10 is some distance from the shared boundary and has its main outlook towards the garden of that property. Together, this would ensure that the proposed extension did not appear overbearing or unduly dominant when seen from the garden room. Neither would it be overbearing when seen from the main rear garden, owing to the distance of separation and the intervening garden room.
12. The entire side extension would be visible from the area to the side of No 10 above the approximately 2m high boundary fence but this area does not form part of the garden that is used for sitting out or for recreation and I am satisfied that no harm to outlook at No 10 would arise.
13. It is therefore concluded on the second main issue that the proposed side extension would have no materially harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers at 10 Tangier Road with respect to outlook. There would thus be no conflict with Policy G1(3) of the LP or with the NPPF which, taken together, expect that new development will secure a good standard of amenity for all existing occupiers and their protection from un-neighbourly development. In addition there would be no conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Extensions, adopted in 2003, which expects two storey extensions to respect the amenities of adjoining occupiers.
14. The Council suggests two conditions in addition to the statutory commencement condition. I agree that a condition requiring the extensions to be built in accordance with the approved plans is necessary in order to provide certainty. Secondly, a condition requiring the materials used to match those in the existing building is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
15. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the Council's reference to light in the delegated officer report, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR