



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/19/3228778

26 Mead Way, Burpham, Surrey GU4 7LG

- 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 Ben Sciberras against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/P/00184, dated 29 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as an "Existing family bungalow to be extended by adding a first floor. Existing single storey garage to be extended to line up with existing rear of building. Rear conservatory to be demolished".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Mead Way.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is currently occupied by a single-storey bungalow, linked by a garage to the neighbouring property 25 Mead Way. Mead Way is a cul-de-sac street which is predominantly characterised by a mix of single-storey dwellings, with varied designs and materials utilised. Opposite the appeal site are two notable exceptions, with both 1 and 2 Mead Way being two-storey dwellings. The entrance to Mead Way is characterised by the side elevations and boundary fencing of 280 and 282 London Road, which are oriented towards London Road. The result being that the appeal property and No 1 serve as the visual entrance to the street scene.
4. Although varied in nature, the diversity of building designs within Mead Way are unified through the use of recesses to vary building facades, varied building materials, and windows to break up the visual bulk and scale of the dwellings. This is particularly evidenced by the existing two-storey dwellings on No 1 and 2, which achieve a harmonious appearance within the street scene. Despite their comparatively large scale, their visual bulk has been reduced using these design elements.

5. The proposal deviates from this design aesthetic by duplicating the footprint of the host dwelling (excluding the garage and utility areas) for the additional storey. This design choice, in combination with the existing width and depth of the dwelling, would result in a bulky and dominant appearance which would be detrimental to the established Mead Way character. The materials proposed at the first-floor level would further intensify this effect. The use of horizontal "hardiplank" panels as shown would present a predominantly uninterrupted façade, unduly emphasising the size and bulk of the extension.
6. Although the proposed additional storey has merits within the context of Mead Way, the proposal does not effectively reduce the visual bulk and mass of the extra storey by using varied façade forms, varied building materials, window placement or similar methods. The use of panelling with a feathered texture along the first-floor extent would not, in my judgement, be sufficient to create a discernible reprieve from the dominance of the horizontal panelling from the street level.
7. It was recommended by the appellant that conditions be imposed to overcome any character and appearance effects identified. I am required to assess the appeal proposal that is before me. In any event, I am not satisfied that conditions would address the harm I have identified without fundamentally altering the proposal.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of Mead Way. It conflicts with saved Policies H8 and G5 (criterion 2, 4 and 7) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (adopted January 2003), and Policy BFD1 of the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2035 (adopted version April 2016). Together these policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development (including extensions) achieves a high quality design which reinforces local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

9. The intention for the proposal to be "eco-friendly" through the capture of solar thermal energy and rain water harvesting is commendable. However, these aspects are common in many proposals and in themselves are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR