



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: 2nd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3309614
56 Yew Tree Drive, Guildford GU1 1NY

- 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 Daniel Levene against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/P/00378, dated 28 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension following demolition of existing attached outhouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Yew Tree Drive is a residential road which loops around and has a mixture of semi-detached and terraced properties. No.56 is a semi-detached property located to the southern side of the road within a straight run of properties comprising Nos.50 to 68 (evens). It appears to be in its original form with a small outhouse projection to the side. The neighbouring property, No.58, has been fully extended to the side with just the width of a gated access to the shared boundary.
4. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) provides general design rules for extensions. In relation to a two storey side extension it advises that they should: not be visually dominant; in keeping with the design of the original house; not exceed half the width of the house; be set back from the front building line; and maintain a gap of at least one metre to the boundary.
5. The proposal would introduce a two-storey side extension which would also project to the rear. The design of the extension would be in keeping and proportionate to the host property. However, it would only be very marginally off set and would infill the entire space up to the boundary and visually would appear as the pair of semis (Nos.56 & 54) are a continuation of the neighbouring terrace.

6. There is some variation in the building line with the appeal property sited forward of the neighbouring terrace and thereby the extension would not be visible in views from west. But from opposite, and in views along the road from the east the extent of the development would be noticeable and would have an adversely impact on the appearance of the street scene through the terracing effect.
7. A number of properties along Yew Tree Drive have two-storey side extensions. From my observations generally where these occur there is more space around the property and/or a change in alignment. Nevertheless, there are some example of extensions similar to the appeal proposal. From the planning history details provided by the appellant these were permitted prior to the SPD, and some spacing is maintained as the neighbouring properties have not been extended. I have not been directed to, nor did I see, any incidents where adjoining properties have been extended as would be the case here. As such the proposal is different as the resultant loss of any meaningful gap would change the relationship between the properties and the character of the area which the SPD seeks to avoid.
8. Overall, I find that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to accord 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, seeks high quality design and to reflect patterns of development and local character. The proposal would also conflict with the advice in the SPD in relation to the design of two storey extensions.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR