



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2021

By Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/20/3255722

15 Mount Pleasant, Farnham GU9 7AA

- 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 G Kirk against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2020/0536, dated 24 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side extension to existing dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the south west side of Mount Pleasant, a no through road off West Street. It comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling with an attached single garage.
4. Mount Pleasant is characterised by detached and semi-detached properties of mixed architectural style. There is no established building line, with buildings set back from the road frontage by varying distances. Although some buildings are positioned close together, at first floor level the streetscene is predominantly characterised by space between adjacent buildings. In this regard the appeal property, by virtue of the space at first floor level above the existing attached single garage, positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed development would extend the property at first floor level above the garage. This would extend the two storey property virtually across the full width of the plot, leaving a gap of only around 0.6 metres to the side elevation of No 11a Mount Pleasant. Thus, the proposal would significantly erode the space that exists at present at first floor level between the host property and No 11a.
6. It is acknowledged that the front elevation of the host property is set back from the front elevation of No 11a and the two properties differ architecturally. However, notwithstanding these factors, the loss of space would be noticeable from the public domain and result in a terracing effect that would be at odds

with, and so not respect, the prevailing pattern of development which is predominantly characterised by space between buildings at first floor level.

7. The proposal would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would not accord with Policy TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018; retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Council Local Plan 2002; and Policies FNP1 and FNP16 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032. Taken together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that new development responds to the distinctive character of the area in which it is located and the spacing between buildings respects the character of the streetscene.
8. The appellant says that an amended proposal, to include a 1.0 metre gap between the proposed development and the side elevation of No 11a, would accord with the Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document. However, any such amended scheme would be a matter for the local planning authority to consider as part of a fresh application. In any event, I have determined the appeal proposal on its individual planning merits based on the evidence before me and concluded, for the above reasons, that it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR