
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/17/3177150

17 Aldersey Road, Guildford, Surrey GU1 2ER

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Hillier against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/P/00789, dated 6 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2017.
 - The application sought planning permission for a rear two storey extension following demolition of the existing conservatory and side extension, without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 16/P/00935, dated 20 July 2016.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: "*The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans...*" (followed by a list of the approved plans).
 - The reason given for the condition is: "*To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of proper planning.*"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the amended proposal on the character of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal seeks approval for an amended form for the rear 2 storey extension, by raising the height of the roof by 0.4m. The existing permission allows a 2 storey rear extension with a flat roof above pitched sections. The approved roof would be set down from the original ridge by 0.85m.
4. The Council sets out that the approval of the original extension took into account, amongst other things, the effects of the extension on the original building. They state that in order for the extension to appear subservient to the original dwelling, the maximum height of the extension was set at 0.85m below the ridge of the original house. From the submitted documents, it would appear that this was a point of discussion and negotiation during the life of the original planning application.
5. During my site visit I was able to gain a good impression of the effects of the approved scheme as it was under construction and the frame-work of the rear

roof was in place, apparently at the previously approved height, 0.85m below the ridge. The rear extension is of a considerable size, spanning the majority of the width of the house. Its height and depth contribute to the impression of size. Its overall dimensions have necessitated the inclusion of a crown roof with a large flat section; in my judgement this adds considerably to the bulky appearance of the extension. I note also that the approved height of the roof appears to be very similar to the height of the front gable of the original house.

6. I consider that the Council are correct in seeking to ensure that the extension remains subservient to the original house. This sizeable extension has a considerable effect on the impression of scale and its roof design adds significantly to this. The truncation of the roof at the approved level would go some way to reduce any dominating effects that the extension may have and I consider that the proposed increase in the height of the roof would have a negative effect by increasing the scale of the extension, resulting in it having a greater and harmful effect on the original house.
7. I appreciate that the extension is at the rear and not highly prominent within the street-scene; however, some views of it are available within the public realm and these would be negatively affected. Furthermore, the views from private land to the rear, where the house is set on slightly raised ground compared to the garden area, would also be negatively affected in this way. As a result, the proposal would conflict with Policies G5 and H8 of the Guildford Local Plan.
8. The appellant has made reference to other forms of development in the area and seeks support from these. Apart from the submitted drawings, I have little information concerning the context of these developments, including what was there originally. Furthermore, having studied the submitted details, some of the examples only serve to reinforce my view of the unacceptable effects of such large buildings/extensions.

Conclusions

9. The relevant condition in its existing form is necessary and reasonable in order to ensure that the extension has an acceptable appearance. The proposed variation would result in an extension of an unacceptable appearance, for the reasons set out above. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR