



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2019

by Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/19/3235473 97 Farnham Road, Guildford GU2 7PF

- 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 Ollie Champion against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/P/00987, dated 23 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is to extend the property at first and second floor levels across a recently completed single storey ground floor extension. Associated internal alterations to layout to improve amenity spaces. Upgrade existing glazing throughout & update exterior finishes to suit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site includes a two-storey detached property that faces Farnham Road (A31), with land levels gradually reducing from the highway frontage. The dwelling has a hipped roof design with a distinctive Mock Tudor style façade that includes a projecting front outrigger, single storey elements, a prominent chimney and a catslide roof section with an associated dormer. The existing windows of the dwelling have predominantly modern uPVC materials with designs incorporating glazing bars. The dwelling also has a single storey rear extension across the full width of the rear elevation, together with a subservient rear dormer and existing rooflights. A detached outbuilding lies close to the rear boundary and sits lower than the dwelling and its rear garden.
4. The appeal proposal includes a large rear extension to create a first and second floor section above part of the existing single storey rear extension. In that regard, the varied style of detached properties that face Farnham Road in the similarly large plots nearby include examples of two storey rear outriggers some of which are situated at raised land levels relative to the appeal property due to a gradual downward slope between the junctions of Friars Gate and Scillionian Road. However, the existing rear outriggers that are visible from the site are broadly subservient to their host properties and roof form. In contrast, the cumulative scale, bulk, depth, massing and roof form of the proposed

extension would be viewed as a disproportionate addition to the rear elevation and roof slope of No 97, irrespective of the lack of increase in the ridge height or footprint of the property.

5. The harmful visual effect of the extension would be worsened by the inclusion of a narrow projecting element from its roof slope with a vertical glazed feature on the rear elevation. The resultant composition of the rear elevation and the side profile of the extension would appear awkward and out of place at first and second floor level when viewed relative to surrounding properties and nearby windows, including the contemporary glazing that has a differing horizontal emphasis at ground floor level. The extension, when taken as a whole, would therefore be an incongruous, dominant and insubordinate addition to the rear elevation of the appeal property.
6. The arrangement of surrounding properties that face Farnham Road to each side and those which face Poltimore Road at the rear, together with established landscaping between the latter properties, would ensure that the rear extension would not be viewed prominently from public vantage points in those street scenes. However, due to the raised land levels of the appeal property relative to those properties that are immediately adjacent to Scillonian Road, the proposed extension to the upper floors of the rear elevation would be visible, particularly above outbuildings located at the rear of No 95 Farnham Road. From that perspective and from private vantage points within the rear gardens of neighbouring properties, the proposed rear extension would be viewed as a conspicuous feature and an incongruous and disproportionate addition at the rear of No 97. Consequently, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character of the host property and the area.
7. In reaching the above findings, I have taken account of the contemporary style of the existing single storey rear extension that includes a flat roof section, part of which would be replaced. However, the presence of the existing rear extension does not replicate nor justify the harm identified, given its position at ground floor level ensures that it is largely screened by boundary treatments and/or intervening buildings from the public and private vantage points where the harm arising from the proposal would otherwise be observed. The mixed palette of materials used on the host property and those surrounding does provide an opportunity for alterations as proposed on the front and side elevations of the existing dwelling including render, clay hanging tiles and replacement windows that would not harm its character. Nonetheless, those elements of the proposal and the use of similar materials on the rear extension do not outweigh the harm identified.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of different property designs and styles in the wider area, including No 37 Poltimore Road, which includes extensions with a vertical glazed feature. However, I observed that the characteristics of those properties, extensions and the relationship to their surroundings are different to the proposal before me and therefore, do not replicate or justify the harm I have identified.
9. I am satisfied that the proposal before me, subject to appropriate conditions if the appeal were to be allowed, would be capable of achieving a satisfactory relationship with surrounding properties so as to preserve the living conditions of their occupiers in terms of matters of outlook, light and privacy. Furthermore, the existing parking arrangements would be unaltered and there

would be no impact on highway safety. However, the absence of concern in those respects is a neutral factor. There would be some benefits for the appellant and his family in terms of an increase in living space and the associated reconfiguration of internal space proposed, but such matters do not outweigh the harm identified.

10. Having regard to all of the above, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015 - 2034, adopted April 2019, and Saved Policies G5 and H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan, adopted January 2003, and the associated guidance in the Guildford Borough Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2018. The policies, when taken together, seek high quality design and enhancement of the environment in which they are set, including preventing unacceptable and adverse effects on the scale and character of the dwelling, the existing context and immediate surroundings. The policies are consistent with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gareth Wildgoose

INSPECTOR