
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3323103

26 Daryngton Drive, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 2QD

- 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 Casper Koorts against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/P/01088, dated 21 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolish existing single storey rear extension, proposed part single, part two storey side and rear extensions, proposed loft conversion including side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing single storey rear extension, erection of proposed part single, part two storey side and rear extensions, proposed loft conversion including side dormers at 26 Daryngton Drive, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 2QD, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/P/01088, dated 21 June 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Location Plan, Block Plan, Existing Ground Floor Plan DN22/01, Existing First Floor Plan DN22/02, Existing Elevations DN22/04, Existing and Proposed Roof Plans DN22/10, Proposed Ground Floor Plan DN22/04, Proposed First Floor Plan DN22/05, Proposed Second Floor Plan DN22/06 Proposed Elevations DN22/07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. 26 Daryngton Drive is a detached two storey house in an established residential area. The surroundings are characterised by a variety of detached

and semi-detached houses set in good sized plots with mature gardens. No. 26 is relatively modest in size compared to most of the nearby houses. It has a good sized rear garden with an outbuilding in the northwest corner.

4. I consider that the relevant policies in this case include H4, D4 and D5 of the Guildford Local Plan Development Management Policies adopted March 2023 (the LPDMP). These relate, among other things, to design, housing extensions and the protection of the amenities of existing residential properties.
5. The proposal would significantly increase the size and scale of the building with additional side elements including dormer windows and most of the increase in built form at the rear. The Council has raised no objection to the design and size of the proposal since the original house is considerably smaller than the majority of other properties in the surrounding area and the proposal would not appear out of character with the street scene. I see no reason to disagree with this view.
6. With regard to the impact of the proposed rear extension on neighbouring residents, I consider that it would not be excessive in the context of the good sized gardens and the variety of single and two storey rear extensions to several properties on either side along the street. No. 28 has a substantial single storey garage set back from the main rear building line on the shared side boundary and No. 24 has single storey rear extensions with a variety of roof pitches. These result in some sense of enclosure in both properties.
7. I consider that the projection of the two storey element beyond the existing rear elevation of the property would not result in an unacceptable impact on the neighbours on either side. There would be a sufficient gap between the side elevations of the houses to provide adequate separation, such that the proposal would not appear visually dominant or overbearing.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents and that, in this respect it is consistent with policies H4 and D5 of the LPDMP.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR