



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2021

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/21/3283265
77 Pewley Way, Guildford GU1 3QB

- 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 Charlotte & Hamilton Pfister & Chapman against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/P/00510, dated 10 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of two storey side extension with integral garage, following demolition of existing garage, single storey rear extension providing enlarged kitchen area, window bay to the front elevation and new porch over altered entrance. Proposed works to also include changes to the appearance of the elevations with new windows and doors, tile hanging and complete render of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the character and appearance of the area; and (2) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, 79 Pewley Way.

Reasons

Character & Appearance

3. The appeal site is a detached house on the corner of Pewley Way and Addison Road set in a triangular shaped plot extending along Addison Road. Whilst its address is Pewley Way, the front door is actually on Addison Road along with a driveway and garage. The house has previously been extended.
4. The proposal would involve a fairly extensive refurbishment and new build including a two storey side extension on its northern end. This would replace a single storey attached garage. Previous extensions have elongated the appearance of the house and although a single storey element would be removed, its replacement with the proposed two storey extension would emphasise the linear appearance of the house and its prominence on this corner location.
5. In terms of the street scene, I find no harm from the other works proposed for the house as there is a mix of detailing to housing in the area and tile hangings and render in particular are not unusual. The proposal overall would include

extensive alterations to the appearance of the house but the side extension in particular would not reflect the style or design of the existing house but would appear at odds to its general character and appearance. The dormer window and the half hipped roof emphasise this.

6. Local Plan (2019)¹ Policy D1 requires all new development to be of a high quality of design that responds to local character. Local Plan (2003)² Policy G5 sets out design requirements for new development and Policy H8 sets out criteria for extensions to dwellings in urban areas. The Council's SPD³ also sets out design principles which seek to ensure that house extensions and alterations are appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing property and the existing street scene around the property. The National Planning Policy Framework⁴ also cites the importance of good design.
7. I consider that the proposal would conflict with these policies with regard to this issue and therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Living Conditions

8. The appeal site, No 77 is almost at right angles to its neighbour, No 79 and the proposal would include a first floor terrace/balcony as well as a Juliette balcony to the master bedroom. The roof terrace/balcony in particular would provide elevated outdoor amenity space from which it would be possible to look towards the rear of No 79. I note that there is already some overlooking from upper floor windows and from an informal roof area accessed from a first floor bedroom. The latter would have limited use due to its lack of railings but a purpose built terrace/balcony would create a more permanent useable area from which to overlook No 79. I noted on my site visit that there was substantial vegetation that provided some screening and any overlooking would be at an angle. Although this angle and the vegetation, should it remain, lessen any actual overlooking, the relationship between the two properties would at the very least create a perception of overlooking that would impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 79.
9. Local Plan (2003) Policy G1(3) seeks to protect the amenities of nearby occupiers from unneighbourly development in terms of privacy, amongst other things. This is reflected in the SPD. I consider that the outside terrace/balcony would impact on the neighbour's privacy in conflict with this policy and SPD. On this issue therefore I consider that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 79.

Conclusion

10. I have found that the proposal would be unacceptable in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. In particular, the two storey side extension and the creation of a terrace/balcony to the rear would be unacceptable. I have considered all matters raised but none alter my conclusion.

¹ Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015 – 2034, Adopted 25 April 2019.

² Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, Adopted January 2003.

³ Residential Extensions and Alterations Guildford Borough Council Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) 2018.

⁴ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).

11. I conclude that the proposal, and in particular the two storey side extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and the rear terrace / balcony would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, 79 Pewley Way. As such the proposal would conflict with Local Plan (2019) Policy D1 and Local Plan (2003) policies G5, H8 and G1(3), the Council SPD and the Framework. The appeal therefore fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR