



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022 by A Humphries BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th AUGUST 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3295195

Talland, 62 Prospect Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5EL

- 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 R & C Scott-Fernandez against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/P/02153, dated 11 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey front & rear extensions following demolition of outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar it relates to the single storey rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at Talland, 62 Prospect Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/P/02153, dated 11 October 2021, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted, insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension only, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Existing & Proposed Site Layouts & Location Plan (FLU.1647.01 Rev.B); Proposed Floor Plans (FLU.1647.03 Rev.B); and Proposed Elevations (FLU.1647.05 Rev.B).

Appeal Procedure

3. 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.

Preliminary Matters

4. There is a degree of variation between the site address given on the application form, the appeal form and the Council's decision notice. I am satisfied that they are seeking to identify the same site, however, the above site address was taken from the application form.

5. There is also a degree of variation between the description of development on the application form and that utilised by the Council on their decision notice. I noted that the appellant had adopted the Council's description of development on the appeal form. Whilst I am satisfied that both descriptions are seeking to describe the proposed development, the above description of development was taken from the Council's decision notice and appeal form as it provides greater clarity.
6. The Council refers in their decision notice to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (2019). However, the Framework was revised in 2021, replacing the previous version, but I am satisfied that my reference to the revised Framework (2021) within this decision would not fundamentally affect my decision-making.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

8. The host dwelling is two-storey and detached and is situated in an area principally characterised by detached post-war and modern housing, with porches and single storey front extensions. Contributing to the character of the street scene, the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings are setback from the street. Driveways and lawns fronting the dwellings create a sense of spaciousness.
9. Whilst the proposed front extension would extend beyond the existing front elevation of the host dwelling, this would not be to a significant degree and would also not be beyond the building line of the adjacent dwelling. The modest scale and the proposed roof set substantially below the catslide and existing roofline, together with the use of matching brickwork and tiles, would result in the proposed front extension appearing subordinate to the host dwelling.
10. The existing front elevation of the host dwelling is slightly asymmetrical in appearance due to the catslide, together with the arrangement and size of windows. The proposed front extension would increase the size of the ground floor window, which would better relate to the existing style and appearance of the upper windows on the host dwelling. The pitched roof of the porch would also reflect the existing pitched window in the catslide. Given the addition of architectural detailing, together with the subordinate appearance, I therefore find that the proposed front extension would improve the balance of the front elevation of the host dwelling compared to the existing appearance.
11. The proposed front extension would be viewed in the context of various architectural styles and projections of porches and single storey front extensions of neighbouring dwellings. The proposed front extension would be in keeping with the building lines of the neighbouring dwellings and a generous setback from the street would be maintained. As a result, the proposed front extension would respect the prevailing character of the street scene.
12. In acknowledging the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Residential Extensions and Alterations (2018) that suggests side walls should be of solid finish with no windows or openings on side walls facing neighbouring

dwelling, the length of an extension should reflect the scale, proportion and massing of the existing property. The Framework (2021) also promotes high quality design that is visually attractive.

13. Whilst I recognise the proposed rear extension would effectively result in an 'infill' and extension to an existing outbuilding, the proposed rear extension due to its depth would add significant massing to the host dwelling compared to the existing built form. The proposed rear extension would therefore be of a scale that would be disproportionate to the size of the host dwelling. The elongated depth and design of the proposed rear extension would collectively create long blank elevations and an expanse of brickwork with limited architectural detailing. This would be unsympathetic in design given the fenestration of the rear elevation of the host dwelling. As a result, the proposed rear extension would be unduly dominant and visually discordant with the host dwelling. I acknowledge that the host dwelling has a large rear garden, however, the depth of the proposed rear extension would represent an overdevelopment as the scale would significantly alter the proportions of the host dwelling.
14. With the proposed extension set to the rear of the host dwelling, the extension would not be readily discernible when viewed from the street scene. Visibility would be limited to a glimpse between the host dwelling and adjacent dwelling due to the separation distance and oblique angle of the view. When viewed from neighbouring dwellings from the rear, the proposed rear extension would also be principally obscured by the outbuilding within the curtilage of the host dwelling and the outbuilding of the adjacent dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed rear extension would not extend beyond the building lines of this outbuilding. Although the proposed rear extension would be unsympathetic to the modest size and proportions of neighbouring dwellings to the north of the host dwelling, given the limited visibility from the street scene and neighbouring dwellings, I am not persuaded that the proposed rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the area.
15. Under s.79(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the power is given to allow a s.78 planning appeal to be determined by a split decision, allowing one part of a scheme and dismissing the rest. This approach has been taken in this instance as it is evident that the front and rear extensions are clearly severable from each other, both physically and functionally.
16. For the reasons above, the proposed front extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, the proposed front extension would comply with relevant sections of the Framework (2021), Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2019) and saved Policy G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan (2003). Collectively, these policies seek high quality design that reflect local character and set out design requirements to protect and enhance the built environment. The proposed front extension would also accord with the principles of the SPD regarding front extensions.
17. Whilst the proposed rear extension would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, for the reasons above, harm would be caused to the host dwelling. The scale and unsympathetic design of the proposed rear extension would be contrary to the relevant sections of the Framework (2021), Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and

Sites (2019) and saved Policy G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan (2003). The proposed rear extension would also be contrary to the SPD.

Conditions

18. In addition to the standard conditions requiring a time limit for commencement of development and adherence to the approved plans, the Council has suggested a condition requiring the use of external materials to match the existing building. In the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene, the condition is necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that in relation to the proposed front extension, the appeal is allowed. However, the proposed rear extension conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that in relation to the proposed rear extension, the appeal is dismissed.

A Humphries

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed front extension but is dismissed insofar as it relates to the rear extension.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR