



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2023

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/22/3305287

7 Woodruff Avenue, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 1XS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Pantling against Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/P/00238, is dated 9 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "First floor extension over garage. Demolition of conservatory at the rear and erection of single storey extension in its place."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension over garage and demolition of conservatory at the rear and erection of single storey extension in its place at 7 Woodruff Avenue, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 1XS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/P/00238, dated 9 February 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A21770.1.0.01 Revision A, A21770.1.0.02, A21770.3.1.02 Revision A and A21770.3.1.01 Revision B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. Prior to making this appeal, the appellant submitted amended plans to the Council. It is not clear whether the Council ever consulted interested parties on these plans. Accordingly, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the plans originally submitted with the application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached house in a street scene comprising principally detached houses of varying scale and appearance, including the extent and scale of forward projections. The spacing between properties in the

street scene varies significantly. Within the near vicinity of the appeal site most houses have first floors as wide as their ground floors, although there are some such as the appeal property that are wider at ground floor.

5. The proposed first-floor extension would project to the front and side of the house. The forward projection would extend as far forward as the existing garage. This would be deeper than the existing two-storey projection and so would be more prominent within the street scene. However, given the varied character of the street scene, the scale and design of the proposed extension would not result in an unacceptable appearance to the proposed dwelling.
6. The extension would significantly reduce the space between Nos 5 and 7 at first floor level. However, the gap would not be completely closed, and would be similar to spacing between houses elsewhere within the near vicinity. It would not therefore result in harm to the appearance of the wider street scene.
7. The existing conservatory to the rear of the house would be replaced by an extension of similar footprint and height. It would not be prominent in views from surrounding properties and would not be harmful to the appearance of the property.
8. Overall, therefore, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with saved Policies G1, G5 and H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 and Policy B-FD 1 of the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan. Taken together these policies require that extensions have no adverse effect on the scale and character of the dwelling, reflect the distinct local character of the area, and be suitably designed within the context for which they are set.

Conditions

9. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and confirming the approved plans, for the sake of certainty.
10. I have also imposed a condition requiring that the development be finished in external materials to match the existing house. While these are indicated on the approved plans, not all external materials are stated to match. This condition is therefore reasonable and necessary to ensure that the finished appearance of the extensions would not be harmful in the street scene and wider area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal succeeds.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR