



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2021

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/21/3273326

Little Orchard, 22 Farncombe Hill, Godalming, GU7 2AU

- 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 John Barrowcliffe against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2020/1874, dated 12 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is refurbishment and two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Further to the appeal being submitted planning permission has been granted for a single storey rear extension and removal of a chimney stack (Council reference WA/2021/01471). These elements are also common to this proposal. The Council has not raised any objections to these elements, and they do not form part of the reasons for refusal. I have, therefore, assessed this appeal only on the side extension.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and the host property.

Reasons

4. 22 Farncombe Hill (No.22) is a detached house with a detached flat roofed garage to the side. It forms part of a row of period properties which step down the hill and have long rear gardens. Beyond No.22 the road curves and the properties are of a different style. The neighbouring property, No.20, has a triangular shaped plot with the rear elevation of the house angled towards the shared side boundary.
5. The extension would infill the area between the house and garage with a first-floor element above. As a result, the property would extend across the full width of the plot. To the front the garage would be altered to an open fronted car port.
6. Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 saved policy D4 seeks high quality design and sets out that proposals should integrate well and be appropriate to the site

in terms of its scale, height, form and appearance. The Council's supporting Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that two storey side extensions should normally appear smaller in mass and scale or be 'subordinate' to the main building. It also explains, *that when looking at two storey side extensions, the impact on the streetscene is critical. The character of an area is created as much by the spaces in between and around the houses as the houses themselves.*

7. No.22 has a distinctive form with an asymmetrical roof and has a strong vertical emphasis with gable features. In contrast, whilst the extension incorporates gables, due to its proportions and the mono pitched roof detailing over the car port and entrance it would have more of a horizontal emphasis. As such, whilst the extension would be subservient in height, I find, particularly to the front, that the extension would be out of keeping with the form and character of the host property and I agree with the Council that it would lack coherence.
8. I acknowledge that there is a mixture of properties in the locality and generally there are limited gaps between them, nor is there a rigid building line. Nevertheless, No.22 is located at a point where there is a transition in the gradient and direction of the road and the style of properties along the northern side of Farncombe Hill. The space between No.22 and No.20 provides a notable physical and visual break in the street scene. In my opinion, completely infilling this area with an extension of the form proposed would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. In my view, the combination of the scale and form of the extension and the loss of space to the side of the property would result in a development which would fail to successfully integrate with the host property or in the street scene. As such, I find that the proposal would conflict with Waverley Borough Local Plan (part 1) 2018 policy TD1, saved policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and Godalming and Farncombe Neighbourhood Plan policy GOD5, which all promote a high standard of design and respect for the character of the area.

Other Matters

10. I accept that the principle of a two-storey extension is appropriate, and that the scheme would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. I am also aware that the proposal has been designed by a chartered architect to address concerns raised to previous schemes. Nevertheless, whilst there are merits to this proposal compared to the earlier schemes this does not justify this proposal which I find would conflict with the development plan. The appellant has also provided details of an alternative design which was put forward to the case officer during the application process. However, that scheme is not formally before me, and I have considered the proposal as submitted on its own merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reason set out above and having regard to all matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Ellis

Inspector