



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2024

by V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/24/3337878

142 Envis Way, Fairlands, Guildford, Surrey, GU3 3NL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Edward Wallace against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/P/01569.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing detached single car garage. Proposed single storey side and rear extensions with living accommodation in the loft space with front, side and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 144 Envis Way, with particular reference to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Envis Way is a well-established residential road, predominantly characterised by pairs of semi-detached bungalows, with single storey forward projecting gable ends. In the immediate vicinity, there is good symmetry within semi-detached pairs and roof forms are largely unaltered. While rear extensions are commonplace, they are largely screened from the public realm. The adjoining property, 144 Envis Way is unaltered aside from a conservatory to the rear.
4. The proposed side extension would create a disproportionately wide gable end frontage, which would be uncharacteristic of the street scene and unbalance this semi-detached pair.
5. The proposal would also introduce an unacceptable scale of development at roof level, through the proliferation of three large dormers. Whilst the ridge would not be extended, these would fail to respect the proportions of the host property and appear incongruous amongst the largely unaltered roof forms in the immediate vicinity. Whilst I agree that views of the property from the roundabout are restricted, the proposed front dormer and side extension would

- be visible when approaching the property from both directions. The proposal would be a prominent addition of unattractive design to the area.
6. I note that there are other examples of dormer additions in Envis Way, but these tend to appear subservient in the roof space and are located to the front or rear. Others set a far from positive design precedent.
 7. There are other examples of extended properties in Envis Way, but those extended to the extent of the proposal, appear to be the exception rather than the rule. 16 Louis Fields is a detached property with a clearly subservient side extension, and a modest dormer has been added to the apex of its roof in a sympathetic and balanced way. In the appellant's examples in Envis Way, the adjoining properties both had alterations at roof level and neither have side dormers. As such the examples are not sufficiently similar to be comparable to the appeal site. In any event, each scheme must be considered and determined on its individual merits.
 8. Whilst the proposed materials are considered appropriate, this does not justify the excessive bulk and massing of the proposal and the negative impact on the character and appearance of the area identified.
 9. The appellant refers to what could be achieved within permitted development tolerances. I have limited information as to any proposed alternative scheme, how it might appear or how it would compare to that proposed. However, the aspects of permitted development cited, would be likely less harmful than the proposed development. As a result, any alternatives that could be carried out under permitted development only carry limited weight.
 10. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies D4 and H4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan Development Management Policies (Adopted March 2023), the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2018, and the Framework, insofar as they seek for development to achieve high quality design that respects the context, scale, appearance and character of adjacent buildings and the surrounding area.

Living conditions

11. There is a good level of privacy between No 142 and 144 Envis Way, due to the boundary treatment/vegetation, and there being no windows at first floor level. The proposed rear dormer will have three rear facing windows. I agree with the appellant that views from the windows would be directed over the appeal site rather than the adjoining property. Given that the rear dormer would accommodate bedrooms, rather than principal living areas, the use of the rooms would be limited, thereby reducing any impact on privacy. This is not an uncommon situation between adjoining properties and in my view would not unacceptably affect the privacy of the occupiers of No 144.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 144 Envis Way, with reference to privacy. As such, it would not conflict with Policy H4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan Development Management Policies Adopted March 2023, and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning

Document 2018, insofar as they seek for development to have an acceptable impact on privacy.

Other Matters

13. At a very high level, the Framework summarises the objective of sustainable development as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Paragraph 135 also states that schemes should promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. However, the Framework equally makes clear that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. The scheme would fail this fundamental aim.
14. There would be some modest economic and social benefits associated with the proposed development in terms of employment during construction and meeting the needs of the occupants. However, these benefits do not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area identified.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR