



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2021

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/20/3259627

20 Long Gore, Farncombe, Godalming GU7 3TE

- 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 & Mrs Barnado against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2020/1022, dated 25 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing detached single garage. Construction of 2 storey front and side and single storey side extensions and new covered porch area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house with a detached single-storey garage, set back behind an open front garden and driveway. It is located on a residential street of detached and semi-detached properties similarly set back from the road. This gives the area a spacious and open character.
4. Properties have pitched roofs which provides some uniformity to the area, although a number have been extended with either porches or more substantial extensions which are set forward of the main elevation and feature front facing gables. These front projections are modest in depth and the original building line of the properties, particularly along the side of Long Gore on which the appeal property is located remains clearly visible.
5. No 20 is positioned where the road curves and does not align fully with all the properties on the street. The proposed extension would be two-storeys. It would project forward of the host property by around 3 metres with a hipped roof. Due to the depth of the front projection beyond the front façade of the building, in combination with its location, the proposed extension would appear large and dominant within the streetscene. It would also disrupt the building

- line, blocking views along Long Gore due to the height and extent of its projection. This would harm the open and spacious character of the area.
6. The height of the extension would match the height of the existing roof and it would not appear subordinate to the host property which would add to its prominence within the streetscene. Furthermore, the hipped roof shape would be at odds with the pitched roof and gable features characteristic of properties within the immediate vicinity. As such the proposal would not be sympathetic to surrounding development.
 7. There are examples of front extensions to other properties along Long Gore, with the largest within the vicinity of the appeal site being a single-storey front and side extension to 24 Long Gore (No 24). However, the proposed development would project substantially further forward than the extension to No 24 and it would also be two-storeys and significantly more obtrusive within the streetscene.
 8. Although the extension would close the gap between No 20 and the neighbouring property, due to the angle of No 20 in relation to this adjacent property, it would not entirely close the gap and a terracing effect would not be prominent within the streetscene.
 9. I appreciate this is an awkward shaped plot with limited space at the rear. however, this does not justify the harm that arises from the proposed development. Furthermore, even with the use of matching materials this would not mitigate the harm that arises from the bulk and projection of the proposal.
 10. The proposed extension would be readily visible in public views and as a result would adversely affect the character and appearance of the street scene. The lack of objections from neighbours does not alter my findings in this respect.
 11. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 and Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Council Local Plan 2002. These policies together require new development to be of a high quality that responds to local character, that does not harm visual character and distinctiveness and is appropriate in terms of scale and height. It would also not accord with the Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2010 which advises front extensions should be lower in height and not normally extend beyond the front elevation by more than 2 metres.

Other Matters

12. The scheme would provide the appellants with additional accommodation for their growing family in a more affordable way than moving. Whilst I am sympathetic to this need, it does not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that I have identified.
13. The appellant has raised the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010 insofar as the provision of extended accommodation would enable elderly family members to be looked after in the family home. However, I have been provided with no substantive evidence that the proposed development is required in relation to elderly relatives. I therefore give this very limited weight.

14. In addition, the proposed development in providing an enlarged property may meet a housing need but I have been provided with no substantive evidence of this. This also carries very limited weight in the balance.
15. The scheme would provide some limited economic benefits from the construction of the development. It may increase Council tax revenues to the Council and while it would increase the value of the property, that is a private matter. The appellant has indicated that the scheme would make effective use of land and will be environmentally friendly. However, I have no specific information relating to this. I therefore give this benefit limited weight.
16. The proposed development would not harm the living conditions of nearby occupiers. However, this is a neutral factor.

Conclusion

17. I have found the proposal would be contrary to the development plan. There are no other considerations that outweigh that conflict and for this reason, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR