



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/21/3289701

115 Addison Road, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 3QE

- 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 Brooks against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/P/01191, dated 27 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Charlotteville & Warren Road Conservation Area (CWRCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling, located in the CWRCA. The site is set back and elevated from the public highway with intervening landscaping and is accessed by a set of steps. The surrounding area is residential, and properties vary in design. The application is for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension and a single storey rear extension.
5. The proposed two storey extension would extend the width of the property toward the neighbouring boundary and introduce a porch, under which the front door would be relocated. Both the extension and the porch would be set back from the principal elevation and sit within the ridge height of the existing dwelling. The extension would be constructed in matching materials to the main dwelling.
6. From the street scene, views would almost be limited to when the development is observed from directly in front of the property. However, the development would add bulk at both ground and first floor level, which would alter the architectural character of the property and cause an imbalance with the adjoining property when viewed from the public domain. Although the style of the properties on Addison Road vary, the appeal site and 113 Addison Road appear as a pair.

7. The rear of the extension would adjoin the existing two storey rear outrigger and sit flush with the rear elevation, creating a valley roof with a matching ridge height. The extension would fail to appear subservient to the main dwelling and would appear incongruous when seen within the context of the adjoining property. Furthermore, the extension would project beyond the original side elevation of the property, and this increase in width and additional bulk would further unbalance the semi-detached pair and undermine the symmetry. Though views would be limited, the alterations would be visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties within the CWRCA.
8. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the CWRCA. As the development would only be seen from a small part of the conservation area, it would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of it. There are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm that has been identified. The development would therefore fail to comply with Policy HE7¹ which requires new development within a Conservation Area (CA) to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
9. The Council have cited Policy G5(7) in their reason for refusal. However, as this relates to the use of materials and the proposed development would match the existing materials of the dwelling and those nearby, it is not considered that the development would conflict with this particular Policy.

Other Matters

10. The appeal site has an internal layout that is very typical of a house of this age. The appellant has expressed a desire to modernise the home by relocating the family bathroom to the first floor. The appellant has also cited Paragraph 202 of the Framework regarding the optimum viable use of a heritage asset. However, whilst it is accepted that the internal changes would improve the usability of the dwelling, the benefits would be modest and relate to a single property, and this matter is afforded limited weight. Furthermore, no evidence suggests that the proposal is the only means of achieving an alternative internal layout. These matters do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

April Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR

¹ Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction 24 September 2007)',