



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: 31st January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3308988

Wealdover, 24 Guildown Avenue, Guildford, GU2 4HB

- 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 Alfie and Katie Atkinson against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref:22/P/00008, dated 5 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension, part single and part two storey front extension and roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the host property and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Guildown Avenue is a private road of large, detached dwellings set within spacious plots. Each property is individual and exhibit a range of architectural styles and materials. The appeal property (No.24) occupies an elevated position with the properties to the other side of the road on lower ground and those opposite the appeal site are single storey.
4. The appeal property is traditional in form with red bricks and a clay tiled pitched roof. The elevation to the road has a projecting glazed two storey feature which extends up to the eaves which the appellant explains was originally an open balcony. Along the front boundary is a wall with hedging and vegetation in front which provides screening. However, due to the ground levels the upper storey and roofscape are visible and the property has a notable presence in the street scene.
5. A large box type dormer is proposed to the front roof slope extending off the new higher ridge line. It would be inset from the flank elevations, nonetheless, it would dominate the roof and the scale, positioning, size of the windows and flat roof form of the dormer are contrary to the advice in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

6. The existing front projection would also be altered, extending above the eaves creating a terrace to the bedroom in the roof with a glazed balustrade extending across part of the dormer adding to the bulk at roof level.
7. Both the dormer and clad projection are conspicuous features which would be further accentuated by their juxtaposition and the materials. In my view, these elements would fail to assimilate with the host property and their scale and form would overwhelm the frontage and would be at odds with the existing character of the property. Other alterations which include a single storey side extension and changes to the existing fenestration follow the form of the existing property and I agree with the Council would be acceptable.
8. I acknowledge that features and materials such as zinc and timber cladding, flat roofs, second floor extensions and balconies are found in the locality. However, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits and the properties along Guildown Avenue are unique. The examples I have been directed to by the appellant are not comparable to the appeal property and several relate to new dwellings. I accept that contemporary additions can work with traditional, however the concerns here relate to the integration and cohesion with the existing property, rather than the form and materials of the specific elements.
9. Whilst the main entrance to the property is to the rear, this does not alter the importance of the relationship between the south elevation and the road. I agree that the existing front projection is not overly sympathetic, but it is subservient. In contrast, I find the alterations to the frontage and the dormer would be prominent and incongruous features which would be significantly harmful to the appearance of the host property and visually intrusive in the street scene.
10. In conclusion, the appeal proposal would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policy G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 and the Council's SPD which amongst other things seek high quality design, and to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

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

G Ellis

INSPECTOR