



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2023

**by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19.12.2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3331365**

**33 Juniper Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 1NX**

- 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 Nick Buckland against the decision of the Guildford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 23/P/01009, dated 12 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2023.
  - The development proposed is a ground floor rear extension, first floor side extension, front porch infill and associated internal alterations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a ground floor rear extension, first floor side extension, front porch infill and associated internal alterations at 33 Juniper Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 1NX in accordance with the terms of the application, 23/P/01009, dated 12 June 2023 subject to the following conditions: -
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of the decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: 2407\_01 – site location plan, 2407\_02 - existing and proposed ground floor plans, 2407\_03 – existing and proposed first floor plans, 2407\_04 – existing and proposed roof plans, 2407\_05 - existing and proposed front and rear elevations, 2407\_06 – existing and proposed side elevations and 2407\_07 – proposed block plan.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. No.33 is a semi-detached two storey dwelling with a flat roof garage to the side. It is sited at a right-angled bend in the road with the flank elevation set some distance back with an intervening grassed area running along the side of Nos.33 and No.31.

4. The properties along Juniper Close are of the same general style and form although many have been extended creating lengthy front facades to some of the semi-detached pairs. The Council does not raise any concerns with the proposed porch and single-storey rear extension, and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, my considerations are restricted to the side extension.
5. The proposed side extension would result in two-storey form up to the side boundary. The extension is not designed to have subservience to the host dwelling, as generally promoted by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – *Residential Extensions and Alterations*, yet the continuous approach would result in a cohesive appearance with the materials and fenestration matching the existing dwelling.
6. As noted by the appellant and seen on my site visit, there are several properties along the road which have similar continuous forms of extensions over the garage and are an integrated part of the character of the area. The existing garage to the appeal dwelling already forms the side boundary and with no neighbour to that side there would be no terracing effect; the impact the SPD guidance seeks to minimise through the setting back and down of side extensions.
7. The proposed extension does not directly follow some of the criteria in the SPD, this is however guidance, and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits. Set some distance back from the road, the extension can be accommodated without appearing out of scale or visually intrusive and in my view would fully harmonise with the existing property and the character of the area.
8. For the above reasons, I consider that the proposed side extension would respect the scale, form and character of the existing property and would not appear dominant or harmful to its surroundings. Consequently, it would not conflict with Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034, and Policies H4 and D4 of the Guildford Borough Council: Development Management Policies (March 2023). Collectively these require developments to respect the existing context, scale, character and appearance of the surroundings and generally be sympathetic to the existing built environment. I also find compliance with the objectives of the SPD as a whole and the National Planning Policy Framework which promotes high-quality design.

### **Conditions**

9. Conditions are imposed to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and the plans in order to provide certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials of the approved development to match the existing property in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is allowed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR