



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 23 October 2023

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3326093

Fairholme, Flexford Road, Normandy, Surrey GU3 2EF

- 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 Matthew Mansfield against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
- The application Ref 23/P/00632, dated 13 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2023.
- The development proposed is the erection of single storey front and rear extension, conversion of loft space to habitable accommodation, roof alterations to include raised ridge height, rear dormer and front chalet style extensions, demolition of conservatory and changes to fenestration.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey front and rear extension, conversion of loft space to habitable accommodation, roof alterations to include raised ridge height, rear dormer and front chalet style extensions, demolition of conservatory and changes to fenestration at Fairholme, Flexford Road, Normandy, Surrey GU3 2EF 2023, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/P/00632, dated 13 April 2023 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: 1872- 200, 1872-211, 1872-212, 1872-215, 1872-216 and 1872-221.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no 1872 – 215.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from part E of the appeal form and the Council's Decision Notice. This is in the interest of clarity.
3. I have also dealt with another appeal (Ref. APP/ Y3615/D/23/3319390) on the same site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property; and

- the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of Claymore, with respect to light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is sited on Flexford Road, a lengthy residential street facing open land. Whilst there is a predominance of bungalows, the road is characterised by a mix of two storey/dormer bungalows and single storey dwellings sat within sizable plots. There is also variety in appearance, with large flat roofed dormers, small, pitched roof dormers, hipped main roofs and gabled roofs visible.
6. The rear dormer would be substantial in width and have a crown roof. Given its scale, the dormer is not separable from the wider redevelopment of the property. I acknowledge that the dormer would be wider than half the width of the roof, contrary to the advice set out in Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (2018) (SPD), however, it would sit comfortably within the rear roof plane of the redeveloped property, set in substantially from both sides and from the ridge and eaves and would be subordinate to the main roof slope. Its roof form would not detract from the character and appearance of the property, and the development's design would result in a cohesive building form.
7. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed dormer would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the property. There is no conflict with Policy D1 of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2019) (SS) and Policies H4 and D4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2023) (DMP), which collectively require development to respect the scale, height and proportions and materials of the surrounding environment and existing property. There is also no conflict with the high quality design goals of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions

8. The neighbour to the east, 'Claymore', is a bungalow with two side windows and doorway facing the appeal property. These windows serve a bathroom and kitchen/dining area.
9. I observed that the kitchen/dining area is also served by large glazed double doors facing the rear, in addition to, within a rear projecting element, side windows facing away from the boundary. As such, this space is served by numerous sources of sunlight and daylight, and the smaller boundary facing window is not the main window serving this room and is a secondary window.
10. The light from this side window and the doorway would, by virtue of the extension's additional height and bulk, be reduced by the proposal, and I note the third party representation about breaking a 25 degree line in this regard and the importance of this room. In addition, the rear facing window/doors face north, limiting natural sunlight. Again, I note the third party representation relating to the amount of sunlight entering the room through this window and door, however, given the secondary nature of the side facing window and door, I am satisfied there would remain sufficient sunlight and daylight serving this space.

11. The single storey projection of this neighbour, and an existing outbuilding/garage on the appellant's side of the boundary would sit in between the rear patio area of Claymore and the appeal property, thereby limiting the impact of the development on light reaching this patio area.
12. I conclude therefore that the development would not harm the living conditions of Claymore, in respect to light. There is no conflict with the protection of amenity goals of DMP Policy D5 and the Framework. There is also no conflict the advice set out in SPD, which sets out that extensions must not seriously affect the amount of daylight and sunlight available to neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

13. Whilst not referenced in the refusal reasons, the officer report raises issue with the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the wide surroundings. There is a variety in architectural appearance within the street scene, with large flat roofed dormers and small pitched roof dormers visible. Whilst these may be of some age and considered under differing policies, they nevertheless are part of the established street scene. In this context the proposed dormer would not appear incongruous, and I am satisfied that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the wider street surroundings.
14. I note that letters of objection from third parties have been submitted and have had regard to these. The conversion of one bungalow to a two storey dwelling would not unduly effect the balance of dwelling types in the area. In any case, each case is considered on its own merits.
15. The existing dwelling is a bungalow of no particular architectural merit. However, it is modest in scale and has an unassuming presence within the street scene. The extensions would add considerably to the upper parts of the building, creating a more substantial structure. Nevertheless, given the mixed surrounding context, the addition of a second floor to the existing single storey property and its design would not therefore appear incongruous, and the proposed raised ridge line would remain clearly below that of the adjacent neighbour, Bramcombe. Its scale and bulk would be comparable to this neighbouring property, and other two storey dwellings along the street, and the retention of the separation gaps to both adjacent neighbours and set back from the highway would limit its impact on the open character of the street. The proposed study would only have a side facing window; however, this would not affect the character and appearance of the surroundings.
16. The first floor rear facing windows face directly down the garden of the appeal property. Any overlooking of either adjoining neighbouring property would be oblique and limited and would not lead to unusable garden space or unacceptable living conditions for the occupiers of either neighbouring property.

Conditions

17. A list of suggested conditions has been provided that the Council and/or the appellants consider to be appropriate. I have considered these in light of the PPG. For clarity and to ensure compliance with the PPG, I have amended some of the suggested wording.

18. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition to ensure matching materials is not necessary as there are elements which sit comfortably within the street scene but do not match the existing property. As such, a condition to secure the conditions as set out on the plans is appropriate. This is to ensure that the dwelling would not appear incongruous within the street scene.

Conclusion

19. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR