



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3328541

73 Burpham Lane, Guildford, Surrey, GU4 7LX

- 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 Michael Lawrence against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/P/00911, dated 26 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey side/rear extension and minor fenestration changes following demolition of garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. I have used the Council's description of development in the above banner heading as it provides an accurate and concise description of the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. It has a single storey lean-to extension across part of its rear elevation and a single detached garage to the side. The site is adjacent to a large commercial building, beyond which is an access serving dwellings in Howard Ridge. The dwellings that front onto Burpham Lane to the south-west of the site are generally mixed in character and appearance.
5. The proposed extension would be of considerable depth, extending out beyond the original rear elevation of the dwelling by about 10.96m and beyond the existing lean-to extension by a further 7.4m. Whilst it would be single storey and therefore lower than the host dwelling, it would nonetheless add significantly to the footprint of the dwelling and due to its overall size and particularly its depth, would represent a disproportionate addition which would overwhelm and detract from the dwelling's original character and appearance. The extension would fail to respect the scale, proportion and mass of the

existing property and would be contrary to the advice set out in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) in this regard.

6. Furthermore, part of the proposed extension would extend beyond the existing flank elevation of the dwelling which would also be contrary to the advice contained within the SPD. This, together with the overly complex roof form on the south-west facing elevation comprising of a hipped roof attached to the lean-to and a further gable would result in the extension appearing as a series of rather piecemeal additions rather than as a well-integrated extension. I acknowledge that the extension would be constructed in matching materials, however, overall, I find that the extension would be at odds with the traditional character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. Whilst much of the extension would be screened by the adjacent commercial building, glimpses of part of the south-west facing elevation would be obtained from Burpham Lane. For the reasons given above, the extension would not appear as a well-integrated addition to the dwelling and as such would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including from the immediate garden environment.
8. In conclusion, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. I therefore find that it would be contrary to Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategies and Sites 2015-2034 (2019), Policies D4 and H4 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 in the SPD. Collectively these policies and guidance require (amongst other things) development to be of a high quality and to reinforce local distinctiveness and to take into account the scale, character, form and proportions of the existing building. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Other Matters

9. I appreciate the contribution the proposed extension would make in meeting the appellant's current and long term accommodation needs. However, this consideration does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. I also acknowledge the appellant's comments regarding the availability of the Council's pre-application advice service. However, this is not a matter that is material to my decision as I am required to determine the appeal based on the scheme before me.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR