



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3325110

11 Caledon Place, Guildford, Surrey, GU4 7YX

- 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 Ms Wu against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/P/02187, dated 28 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor front extension above garage with alteration to roof and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first floor front extension above garage with alteration to roof. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension at 11 Caledon Place, Guildford, Surrey, GU4 7YX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/P/02187, dated 28 December 2022, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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: Dwg Nos: 600/PL/01; 600/PL/02/Rev B; 600/PL/04/Rev B; 600/PL/06/Rev B; 600/PL/08/Rev B; 600/PL/10/Rev B; 600/PL/11/Rev B; 600/PL/12/Rev B; 600/PL/13/Rev B; and 600/PL/14/Rev 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 Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey detached house next to a turning head in a small cul de sac. Houses are set back behind front gardens and tarmacked drives and most have attached garages. Groups of houses share common design features. The appeal property and several other houses have double garages at the side of them, which project forward, giving the front elevation a stepped profile and wider frontage than other houses nearby. These houses have a hipped roof at the end where the garages are located and a gable end on the other side. As a result, the roof ridge is reduced at one end and, in several cases including at the appeal site, the hipped roof section extends down to form a catslide over the garage. This varied roof profile breaks up the mass of the houses and lessens the visual impact of their wider frontage.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) has a general presumption against front extensions because of their prominence in the street scene. The proposed development includes a hip to gable extension on the main roof, adding accommodation above the garage and replacing the catslide roof with a gable end with 3 first floor windows. The hip to gable extension would extend the roof ridge and elongate the roof plane, drawing attention to the property's wider frontage. In this regard it would appear at odds with other similarly sized houses which, as noted above, have a lesser visual impact because of their varied roof form.
6. I note that other houses have 2 storey elements which project forward and have gable ends. However, these are part of the main house, rather than extensions above attached garages, and thus do not extend to the side of houses as would be the case with the appeal property. Furthermore, they are similarly proportioned and have 2 windows at first floor level. The proposed extension would be wider than other gable projections and the additional window would draw attention to the difference in width. As a result, it would appear out of proportion and would not integrate well with the host property or reflect the design of similar elements on other houses nearby. Despite the limited views of the site, because of its end of road location, there would be harm to the appearance of the house and immediate surroundings. These elements of the proposal would not therefore accord with Policy D1 of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 (2019), Policies H4 and D4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2023), Policy B-FD 1 of the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan (2016) and the guidance set out within the SPD which require high quality design that takes into account the scale, character, form, and proportion of the existing building.

Other Matters

7. A conservatory covers less than half the rear of the house. It is proposed to replace this with a full width rear extension with 2 sets of sliding glass doors. It would be flat roofed with a skylight and lantern and be a similar height to the existing conservatory. This element of the proposal would comply with the SPD in that it would not exceed the width of the house and would use matching materials. I therefore agree with the assessment in the Council's Officer Report that it would not harm the character of the dwelling or the surrounding area. As it is physically and functionally severable from the roof and garage extensions, I consider a split decision would be appropriate to allow planning permission for this element of the proposal.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the single storey rear extension. However, in relation to the first floor front extension above the garage and the alteration to the roof the appeal should be dismissed.
9. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR