



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2019

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/19/3220900

27 Fairlands Road, Fairlands, Guildford, GU3 3JA

- 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 Mrs Jackie Boyton against the decision of the Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/P/02008, dated 17 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is the part conversion of garage to habitable accommodation, two storey rear extension, first floor side extensions and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the part conversion of garage to habitable accommodation, two storey rear extension, first floor side extensions and alterations to fenestration at 27 Fairlands Road, Fairlands, Guildford in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/P/02008 dated 17 October 2018 subject to the following conditions: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BA044_03_001 – Location and Block Plans and BA044_03_002 Rev A – Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations.

Preliminary matters

2. During the appeal process the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites was adopted April 2019 (Local Plan 2019). The Local Plan 2019 includes changes to the Green Belt boundary and the appeal site is now inset from the Green Belt as shown on the proposals map. Policy H9 of the Guildford Local Plan 2003 (Local Plan 2003) referred to in the decision notice is no longer of relevance as the site is outside the Green Belt and in any event this policy has been superseded.
3. Both main parties have been given the opportunity to comment on these changes. The Council have advised that the relevant policies in this case are now saved policies H8, G1 (3) and G5 of Local Plan 2003. Saved policy G1 (3) was not identified in the decision notice and relates to the protection of amenities to which there is no identified concern. I have no reason to depart

from that position and therefore policy G1 (3) is not of direct relevance to the main issue of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The dwelling is sited within a row of traditionally constructed detached properties with pitched roofs and bay windows to the front. Whilst they form a pleasant street scene, these buildings are not of any special character or uniformity.
6. The proposed rear extension would be wider than the existing house and so it would be visible from the road, but many of the properties along Fairlands Road have rear extensions which are also wider than the original two storey front elevation. Therefore, the width of the extension would not be uncharacteristic of the street-scene. In contrast to those existing extensions, which have pitched roofs, the appeal proposal would result in a flat roofed box like element visible over the garage together with a slight projection to the other side of the dwelling. The element above the garage would be in two sections with the wider element set further back and as such, the amount visible from the street scene would not be overly prominent.
7. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that "*the materials and detailing used in an extension should usually respond to and match that of the existing property.*" That said, there is no definitive requirement to match and there are images within the document which show extensions of a more contemporary design and of different materials to their host buildings. Furthermore, the Framework is clear in seeking high quality design that is sympathetic to local character, but this does not prevent appropriate innovation or change.
8. The proposed white render material is found in the area and there are a number of properties where this, or white paint, sits comfortably with the red brick. Notably, the neighbouring property, No 25, where the first floor level comprises white render including the front of the rear extension which is visible over the garage.
9. On the south eastern elevation, the extension would be set back and would comfortably sit on top of the flat roof garage. To the other side the slight projection would be of a width similar to that of a chimney, albeit of greater depth and it would align with the roof overhang. Furthermore, being located on the very rear of the existing property and due to the positioning of the neighbouring properties, this element would not be visually dominant in the street scene, with the character of the original property remaining prominent.
10. To the rear, the first floor of the extension cantilevers over the ground floor to create a rectangular box form and the extension would not align with the existing eaves. Whilst this would form a bold contrast with the existing property, for the reasons set out above, I consider that the design would be acceptable.

11. The SPD indicates that the primary consideration for rear extensions is the impact on the rear amenity space and impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal, as outlined by the Council, would not result in any adverse impacts to the neighbours or the amenity space for the existing property which has a large rear garden. The development would comply with the SPD guidelines (page 23) for rear extensions in terms of reflecting the scale, proportion and mass of the existing property and having a solid finish to the side walls.
12. Overall, I find the proposal would be of an appropriate scale for the existing property and corresponds with those constructed to neighbouring properties. While the design is different, I find that it would be respectful to the existing property and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the proposal would not conflict with saved policies H8 or G5 of the Local Plan 2003 and would be in general conformity with the SPD. Amongst other things these require extensions to have no unacceptable effect on the existing context and character of the immediate surroundings, and to respect the scale, height, proportions and materials of the surrounding environment.

Conditions

13. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. The Council have not suggested any other conditions and I have no reason to disagree with that view.

Conclusion

14. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR