



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3293074
20 Parsons Way, Tongham GU10 1FB

- 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 Zoltan Horvath against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/P/01871, dated 29 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new single storey garage and alterations to kerbs and verge surrounding house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Parsons Way is a relatively new residential development of two storey properties. No.20 is a detached 'L' shaped property located within the centre of the development fronting an area of open space. It occupies a corner plot with a double garage and driveway to the rear which is shared with No.21. This type of parking arrangement is replicated at various other properties, and throughout the development garages are set back and generally positioned between properties.
4. The proposed garage would in fill the area between the property and the rear boundary wall, effectively aligning with the flank elevation of No.21 to the other side of the driveway. The gap, referenced by the appellant, between the proposed and existing garage (which is to be retained) would not be discernible from the front, resulting in a visually unbroken length of built form.
5. Whilst the general design of the garage reflects the appearance of the host property it would have a greater depth and extend forward of the existing side elevation. Due to the forward projection up to the edge of the road the garage would, in my view, have an undue prominence both in relation to the host property and in the street scene.
6. I accept, given the location along a short cul-de-sac serving Nos.20 &21, that the proposed garage would not be overly visible from within the wider

development. Nonetheless, in my opinion, the proposal would create a contrived juxtaposition between the two garages and have a cluttered appearance with the side elevation to No.20 dominated by parking. The existing verges are limited in size, but they provide a visual and physical buffer between the property and the road and are part of the planned layout, providing some soft landscaping within the relatively high-density development.

7. It was evident from my site visit that the existing shared driveway does accommodate vehicles parked side by side, but that the space around them is restricted. The rear boundary wall to No.20 is in set from the garage wall impinging on the width of the parking area. The proposed garage would follow this alignment, further exacerbating the enclosure of the driveway which could continue to be used by the occupiers of No.20. Additionally, the proposed parallel parking space to be sited immediately adjacent to the property would be similarly constrained on one side.
8. The proposed garage would provide additional parking provisions, although there is nothing before me to suggest that the existing garage, which is wider than the driveway and the same size as the neighbours, cannot be used. Whilst I understand that the existing parking layout may provide some practical issues for users, I do not find that the benefits of the proposal to the occupiers of No.20 outweigh the wider public harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. Overall, I therefore find that the proposal would be an incongruous form of development which would fail to create a visually attractive layout and would be out of keeping with the character of the area. The development would be contrary to policies D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2015 - 2034 and saved policies H8 and G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003. Together these require that development is of a high-quality design and has no unacceptable effect on the character of the host dwelling, adjacent buildings, and immediate surroundings. In this regard it would also conflict with the guidance within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2018 and the advice within the National Planning Framework which support good design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR