



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: 21.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3327788 73 High Path Road, Guildford GU1 2QL

- 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 James Hill against the decision of the Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/P/00369, dated 23 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing two storey and lean two extensions and conversion of loft space to habitable accommodation with changes to roof to include gable end type roof to the front elevation with roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on: -
 - The character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties (No.71 and No.75) with particular regard to light and overbearing impact.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. No.73 is a semi-detached property of a traditional form and is reflective of other properties along High Path Road. It has a hipped roof and to the rear is a two-storey outrigger with the addition of a single-storey lean-to beyond.
4. The proposed alterations to the roof and rear elevation would result in a "boxy" appearance extending across the full width and height of the property. The mansard roof and extension would dramatically alter the profile and consume the existing property.
5. From my site visit it was evident that many properties along High Path Road have been altered, particularly to the rear, and there is a degree of non-symmetry to some of the semi-detached pairs. Nevertheless, the specific examples the appellant has referred me to are not directly comparable. The

roof alterations (changing the hip to a gable end and adding a dormer window) at No.46 were achieved through permitted development rights and the rear extension to No.44 is set down and that property does not have a two-storey outrigger. Moreover, the proposal is for a combination of roof alterations and rear extensions and the resultant form and scale would be very different.

6. The proposed design is counter to the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - *Residential Extensions and Alterations 2018* (SPD) which promotes a subordinate approach, to complement the existing roofscape, avoid flat roof dormers and not exceed the existing ridgeline. While I acknowledge that the guidance is to be applied flexibly, in my opinion, the proposal fails to respond to the composition and character of the existing dwelling with the two-storey extension and roof alterations being an unsympathetic addition. Aligning to the rear with the extension to the adjoining property and limited in height, I do not find the single-storey element objectionable. However, as it is to extend off the proposed two storey extension it is not severable, and it adds to the overall scale and bulk of the proposed development.
7. The alterations would not be overly prominent from the street, nonetheless, due to their bulk, height and design they would result in an incongruous form of development which would dominate the host property, causing harm to its character and appearance and that of the immediate surroundings.
8. The development would increase the size of the property to the benefit of the occupiers and there would be economic benefits associated with the construction. However, these would also occur with a different form of extension and do not outweigh the harm that would arise from the poor design.
9. The development would therefore be contrary to 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) and the SPD which require high-quality design that takes into account the scale, character, form, and proportion of the existing building. There would also be a conflict with the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Neighbours

10. The other half of the semi-detached pair (No.75) has both two-storey and single-storey flat roof extensions off the outrigger. The proposed development would not project beyond these elements and whilst there would be an increased height there would be no direct effect on the outlook from the rear first-floor windows of the adjoining property.
11. The proposal would align the rear projection with the existing flank elevation. This would increase the massing of the side elevation, however, in my view, having regard to the separation and depth of the projection it would not be so substantial to have an unduly overbearing impact on No.71. Similarly, as the neighbour is to the north, the appeal property will currently cast a shadow over part of No.71's garden at certain times. I do not consider the extent of any additional overshadowing would have a significant adverse impact on light to affect the occupier's use of their garden.
12. Therefore, I do not find the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties to conflict

with Policies H4 and D5 of the Guildford Local Plan: Development Management Policies.

Conclusion

13. Whilst I have not found harm to the neighbours' amenity, the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property. There are no other considerations of weight which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the Development Plan and therefore the appeal is to be dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR