



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2023

**by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27 January 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3310175**

**69 Sheeplands Avenue, Guildford GU1 2SJ**

- 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 and Mrs Wood against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref: 22/P/00981, dated 7 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2022.
  - The development proposed is a two storey side extension following the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and part single/two storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing rear single storey conservatory.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The appeal proposal incorporates a number of elements. The Council have raised no concerns with the single storey and two storey rear extensions, and I have no reason to disagree with that assessment. Therefore, my considerations below are restricted to the side extension which is the matter in dispute.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

4. Sheeplands Avenue is formed of pairs of semi-detached properties with single storey projections to the side. The scale and form of the side projections maintains a visual separation between the properties and contributes to the regularity and rhythm of the street scene. No.69 is a semi-detached pair with No.71 and is reflective of this form, it is sited opposite the end of Four Acres and as such is seen in various views.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations: Guildford Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) explains that the Council seeks a high standard of design to house extensions and to ensure that they are appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene. Specifically in relation to two storey side extensions the SPD advises that as a general rule a distance of at least one metre should be

- maintained to the boundary which is to prevent a terracing effect and changes to the character of an area.
6. To the front the two-storey extension would be set back and down from the host property, and to the rear it would be slightly angled away from No.67. Nonetheless, the extent of these features is limited, and the extension would infill the entire gap up to the side boundary. The extension would sit alongside the single storey pitched roofed extension to No.67 which has recently been constructed and is on higher ground. The proposal would create a continuous built form and the loss of space at the upper level would visually disrupt the existing pattern of development.
  7. I acknowledge that there are some properties within the surrounding area which benefit from side extensions. From my observations, where these occur along Sheeplands Avenue generally they have greater subservience, or a gap is maintained to the boundary. Additionally, the examples referenced by the appellant were mostly permitted several years ago. Moreover, they are found sparingly in the wider area and, in my opinion, have not altered the prevailing character of the area. Thereby their existence does not persuade me that the appeal proposal would be appropriate, and each case is to be considered on its own merits.
  8. Overall, I find that the proposed side extension would erode the spacing between the semi-detached properties and the resultant visual terracing effect would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
  9. I therefore find conflict with policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 and, saved policies G5 and H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, which among other things, requires new development to be respectful, proportional and reflect patterns of development and distinct local character. As such, the proposal would also conflict with the advice in the SPD and with Government Policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and the National Design Guide.

### **Other Matters**

10. I acknowledge that the Council have not raised any objections to the general design of the extension which reflects the form and materials of the host property. There would also be no adverse impacts on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. Nonetheless, these aspects do not outweigh the harm I have found to the character of the area and the associated conflict with the development plan.

### **Conclusion**

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

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR