



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/21/3280089

87 Bushy Hill Drive, Guildford, Surrey GU1 2UG

- 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 J Andrews against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/P/01066, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, 89 Bushy Hill Drive.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached house that has an existing single storey rear extension that is elevated above the level of the rear garden. The proposal would add accommodation above providing additional first floor living accommodation. The adjoining house has not been extended to the rear.
4. Local Plan (2003)¹ Policy H8 sets out criteria for extensions to dwellings in urban areas and, amongst other things, supports extensions that do not have an unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy and access to sunlight and daylight. The Council's SPD² also sets out guidance to ensure that extensions do not have an adverse impact on neighbours' amenity.
5. The neighbouring house, No 89 lies to the north of the appeal site so it is likely that the existing extension causes some loss of light to the existing ground floor and outdoor amenity space. The existing extension has a flat roof but the proposal would add another floor with a pitched roof very close to the boundary with No 89. Whilst there is some question about whether the first floor windows to No 89 serve habitable rooms or not, the added height, close to the boundary would have an impact on No 89. From my observations it would seem that the upper floor windows of No 89 serve a bathroom and a landing and so the

¹ Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, Adopted January 2003.

² Residential Extensions and Alterations Guildford Borough Council Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) 2018.

impact on them would not be as significant than if they were bedrooms. This does not rule out my concern about the impact on the ground floor and the neighbours' amenity space.

6. Given that the proposed extension would be for most of the width of the existing house and very close to the boundary, I consider it likely that any loss of light to the occupiers of the neighbouring house would be exacerbated. This would conflict with Policy H8 and the SPD. I also consider that the extension would appear quite overbearing when viewed from No 89.
7. I have considered all matters raised including the other policies referred to but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers on No 89, it would conflict with Policy H8 and the SPD and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR