



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November, 2017

by **S. J. Buckingham, BA (Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI FSA**

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

Decision date: 5th January, 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/17/3180992

First Floor Flat, 22 Haydon Place, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 4LL

- 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 A Al-Hassani against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 17/P/00790 dated 6 April, 2017 was refused by notice dated 28 June, 2017.
 - The development proposed is retention of natural slate roof tiles to the main roof, the insertion of two Velux windows, one on either side of the roof slope and retention of rear windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this case is whether the development would preserve the character or appearance of the Guildford Town Centre Conservation Area, and the effect on its significance.

Reasons

3. Although no detailed appraisal has been put before me, it is clear from the evidence I have and from viewing it on site that the significance of this part of the Guildford Town Centre Conservation Area lies in its character as an area largely of late nineteenth century terraced housing set to the north of the commercial heart of the town on the High Street and North Street. While punctuated by some relatively large twentieth century and later developments, sufficient of this historic townscape survives to ensure that this character nonetheless predominates.
 4. No 22 Haydon Place is a narrow end-of-terrace building on the corner of Haydon Place and Martyr Road and on the western margin of the conservation area. Views of the rear of the building, looking south along Haydon Place, also take in the regular rhythm of gabled rear extensions and traditionally designed windows of adjoining houses along Martyr Road and glimpses of the traditional commercial premises on North Street, framed by traditionally scaled and designed buildings. These views reflect the original urban grain and design approaches of the area, largely feature a traditional palette of materials and restrained colours, and thus make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
-

5. The window to the rear of the back extension of the appeal building at first floor level has already been replaced with two smaller ones. The evidence supplied and visible on the brickwork, including the retained window arch, indicates that the original window was in a single, larger opening, of traditional elongated proportions, set in a recess and with a cill, aligning with and matched the window at ground floor level. It thus reflected the age and traditional design of the property.
6. The new window openings are small, squareish and mismatched. The windows which have been installed are of uPVC and sit on the outer plane of the rear elevation. They are of a bright white colour and glossy texture, and have thick frames. The larger of the two windows also has horns, which result in an unnecessarily elaborate design for a window of this size.
7. The taking these features together, the resulting appearance of the windows overall is alien and obtrusive in the context of the character of this part of the conservation area, and due to their location at high level, conspicuous in views of the appeal building itself and the conservation area looking south along Haydon Road. They would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would be harmful to its significance.
8. Although the appellant has suggested that other windows in the vicinity have been replaced in uPVC or aluminium, I noted none in adjacent nineteenth century houses that were similarly conspicuous, while those in more recent housing were of muted colours and related to the design of their host buildings.
9. The development therefore fails to comply with saved policy HE7 of the Guildford Local Plan 2003 (the LP) which requires new development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, and with policy G5 of the LP, which seeks development which respects the character of existing streets and buildings. Policy H8 of the LP relates to residential extensions, and I conclude that it is not applicable to this appeal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. However, given the minor nature of the development, I conclude that for the purposes of this paragraph, the harm caused would be less than substantial.
11. Paragraph 134 of the Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. As no consideration of any public benefits of the scheme has been put before me, and as I have identified none, I conclude that the harm is not justified.
12. For this reason, and for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Buckingham

INSPECTOR