
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3306460

81 Lime Grove, Guildford GU1 1PQ

- 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 Thomas Bruder against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/P/02328, dated 4 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of timber framed lean-to with semi-transparent polycarbonate side panel and roofing, erected on existing driveway to provide protection and for accessing mobility scooter (retrospective application).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of this property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this semi-detached house, which is located in a residential area of similar houses. The houses are set behind front gardens and most have an area for car parking within the frontage.
4. The house has a single-storey element at the side, which is set back from the frontage of the house and this is matched by a similar feature on the neighbouring property. The majority of the houses in the area also have a similar feature although some have evidently been modified.
5. The development which is the subject of this appeal has been erected in front of this recessed side part of the house and is set back from the main, 2 storey front elevation of the house. The structure has a timber frame and consists of plastic sheeting to the side and for the roof. It provides shelter for a mobility scooter.
6. Although it is set within this recessed area between the 2 houses, the structure appears as an obvious addition to the area. The use of non-matching materials and its rather makeshift appearance mean that it fails to harmonise with the existing house and add to its unacceptable visual effects. In my judgement, it

is a prominent and obtrusive feature, which has a negative effect on the house and the area.

7. Policy H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (LP) states, amongst other things, that planning permission to extend dwellings in the urban areas will be granted provided that the development: 1. Has no adverse effect on the scale and character of the dwelling; 2. Has no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy and access to sunlight and daylight; 3. Has no unacceptable effect on the existing context and character of the adjacent buildings and immediate surroundings. Policy G5 includes a requirement that new buildings should respect the scale, height and proportions and materials of the surrounding environment. Policy D1 of the Local Plan Strategy and Sites (adopted 2019) refers to the need for new development to achieve a high quality of design. Having taken account of these requirements, I consider that the development which has been undertaken, fails to perform positively and has a harmful, negative effect on the surrounding area.
8. I have taken account of the fact that the development has been constructed to shelter a mobility scooter at the property. However, the need for such provision is outweighed by the negative effects of the proposal, that I have set out above. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR