

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2023

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3322974

9 Longmead, Guildford, GU1 2HN

- 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 & Mrs Arvind & Deepika Bawa against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/P/02128, dated 16 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension, garage conversion, first floor side extension, part single and part two storey rear extension & fenestration changes to the external appearance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension, garage conversion, first floor side extension, part single and part two storey rear extension & fenestration changes to the external appearance at 9 Longmead, Guildford, GU1 2HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/P/02128, dated 16 December 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site block plan 006 10/03/2022; Proposed floor plans 003 Rev 09 22/11/2022; Proposed roof plan 004 Rev 07 22/11/2022; and Proposed elevations 005 Rev 07 22/11/2022.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached house with single storey attached garage set in a good-sized rectangular plot. It fronts a road of established residential character with mainly two storey homes in similar sized gardens. The dwellings vary in elevational style and roof form, front and rear building lines are not of a
-

regular nature. Gaps to side boundaries tend not to be over-generous but are often eased by the use of hipped roofs. The overall picture is one of pleasing suburban appearance. The proposal is as described above.

4. The Council is concerned that the extensions and alterations by virtue of their form, scale, bulk and design would be unsympathetic to the existing dwelling and impact upon the qualities of the street scene.
5. It is certainly good design practice that in most cases extensions and alterations should take their lead from the form of the host property and design guidance for extensions underlines this. However, there can be exceptions when mirrored design and subservience are not necessary and, in my opinion, this is one such example.
6. In this case it seems to me that this can reasonably be looked as a re-modelling and enlargement of the original property; almost a starting again. The current home is of very unremarkable appearance, elevationally and in ground coverage more diminutive than many in the road, has gable ends (with one close to a side boundary) when hip roofs predominate, and generally adds little to the aesthetic quality of the locality. It would thus be no great loss for a fresh look at what should stand on this plot.
7. In this context I find that the proposal would result in a well-designed dwelling, with a pleasing and appropriately modelled front elevation, not too large for its site, comfortably on a par with other dwellings found locally, and not leading to any reduction in the character or visual qualities of this street scene.
8. Policy D1 of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 and Policies H4 and D4 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies (2023) are relevant. Taken together, and amongst other matters, the policies seek to secure development which is of high design quality, well proportioned, responsive to distinctive local character, protective or enhancing of the streetscene and local context, and generally sympathetic to existing built environment. I conclude that this proposal would not conflict with these policies.
9. I should add that I have also considered the matter of residential amenity for neighbours having regard to disposition, ground levels, orientation, planned built form and so forth. Whilst I appreciate that there will be some change in, for example, outlook from, particularly, No. 7 Long Mead I would agree with the Council's analysis which concluded that there would be no unacceptable impact in terms of residential amenity. There would not be a breach of development plan policies in this regard.

Conditions

10. I consider that the standard commencement condition should be applied. The Council calls for a condition relating to materials matching the existing building but this is unnecessary as materials are specified within the application. However, I agree with the Council that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR