



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3330204

87 The Street, West Horsley, Surrey, KT24 6BG.

- 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 and Mrs P and N Marazzi against the decision of Guildford Borough Council
 - The application Ref 23/P/00881, dated 23 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear and side extension following demolition of a single storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear and side extension following demolition of a single storey rear and side extension at 87 The Street, West Horsley, Surrey, KT24 6BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/P/00881, dated 23 May 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) 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.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 18.003 002-001, 010, 100, 101, 102, 200, 201, 18.003 500-010, 100 Rev03, 101 Rev02, 102 Rev01, 200 Rev03 and 201Rev 02.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property, the character of the street scene and thereby whether the development would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Horsley Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 87 The Street, is a detached two-storey dwelling. It is located in an established residential area within the West Horsley Conservation Area.

4. The appellants propose a two-storey rear and side extension following demolition of part of an existing single storey rear and side extension. The proposed addition would largely be contained within the footprint of the earlier extension to be demolished. It would have the same ridge height as the host property and be of a contrasting and more contemporary design.
5. Due to the property's location close to the boundary and the retained earlier additions I shall consider the proposal façade by façade, as identified on the application drawings.
6. Left side elevation: despite the ridge and eaves lines of the extension being the same as those of the main roof, the addition would be set back. Therefore, and while also having regard for the small blank gable over the first floor window and the more contemporary fenestration pattern the addition as designed would, in my judgement, appear sub-servient to the host property.
7. Rear elevation: when viewed in this elevation the cats slide roof along with the contrasting contemporary glazing, would despite the additions two-storey height and projection in front of the rear façade again result in a sub-servient addition. Further, in contrast to the existing single storey addition, which has an uncomfortable relationship to the main house, the proposed extension would appear as a well-mannered addition to the house.
8. Right side elevation: I consider that the extension when viewed from this side would not cause harm to the host property and overall would appear more attractive than the current single storey addition to be removed.
9. Front elevation: The proposed two-storey extension would be set well back from the front façade of the house and above the roof of the retained single storey garage that projects almost up to the street boundary. Notwithstanding that the ridge and main eaves height would be the same as the main house I do not consider that the proposed addition would appear visually dominant when viewed from the street.
10. The mass of neighbouring property, 89 The Street is, despite additions to its south side, located towards the centre of a wide plot. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that that the introduction of a two-storey addition here, albeit close to the boundary, would, due to its massing and height visually infill the gap between the two properties as asserted by the Council.
11. For the foregoing reasons I conclude in respect of the main issue that overall, the proposed extension as designed would not appear as an unsympathetic addition to the host building or cause harm to its architectural integrity. Further, it would not significantly reduce the visual gap to number 89 thereby leading to a dominant and overbearing visual relationship with the adjacent property to cause harm to the character of the street scene. The proposal development would serve to conserve the West Horsley Conservation Area.
12. The proposal would therefore accord with the objectives of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policies D1 and D3 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 (Adopted 25 April 2019), Policies H4, D4, D18 and D20 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (Adopted 22 March 2023), Policies WH1 and WH2 of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2033 (Adopted December 2018), the guidance set out within the Guildford Borough Council

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2018 - Residential Extensions and Alterations and the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Design Guide as they relate to, amongst other things the quality of development and the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Conditions

13. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
14. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR