



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/24/3340365

12 Pewley Way, Guildford, Surrey GU1 3PY

- 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 Phillips against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/P/01859.
 - The development proposed is for a first-floor extension over family room, loft conversion with solar panels and changes to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has submitted an alternative scheme as part of the appeal which has not been considered by the Council nor have other parties been notified. An appeal is not the process to evolve a proposal, and I have considered this appeal based on the plans on which the Council made its decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No.12 is a detached property located on the southwestern side of Pewley Way where properties occupy an elevated position set back from the road. To the other side the properties are on lower ground, nonetheless, there is a consistency in the style and materials of the detached and semi-detached properties, in particular the pitched, clay-tiled roofs and tile hanging to the front elevation.
5. The appeal property occupies the majority of the width of the plot and extends over four stories with a steeply pitched hipped roof. Due to the staggered building line, the northwest flank elevation is fully visible in views along Pewley Way from the west, whereas the other flank is primarily screened by No.14.
6. The proposal would add a first floor to the existing rear extension, and together with a large dormer create accommodation within the roof. The development would add substantial bulk and massing to the rear and in particular the large dormer and gable projection at roof level would result in a top-heavy form.

7. Protruding beyond the pitch of the existing roof, and exacerbated by the boxy form and modern fenestration, the proposed development would be at odds with the style and character of the host property.
8. The proposed extensions would not be subservient as advocated in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2018). The guidance also advises that the roof of a dwelling has a major impact on the character of the building, which forms an important role within the wider street scene and that the size and design of dormer windows need to be sympathetic to the existing and neighbouring properties
9. Many of the properties along Pewley Way have been extended including various dormer windows. Some of these are more successful in their integration with the existing property than others. However, while there are some large extensions they are primarily set down, utilise pitched roof dormers and the materials of the existing property. The background to the various extensions referred to by the appellant are not before me, but each proposal is to be assessed on its own merits.
10. I nonetheless acknowledge that extensions do not have to replicate the design of the existing building and that more contemporary forms and materials can harmonise with older properties which is illustrated in some of the examples referenced by the appellant. Be that as it may, in this case, I find that in combination the design, massing and siting of the alterations would fail to respect and would detract from the appearance of the existing property. While no changes are proposed to the front elevation the protrusion to the side of the roof, and the increased depth and massing to the rear would be visible in views along the street and close the gap to the neighbouring property.
11. In conclusion, the proposal would result in dominant and unsympathetic additions to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property. The design, scale and massing at roof level would be an incongruous form of development, out of keeping and visually intrusive in the street scene. The proposed development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2015 - 2034, Policies D4 and H4 of the Guildford Borough Council Development Management Policies 2023, and the SPD. Together these seek to ensure high-quality developments which reinforce local distinctiveness, and for extensions to take into account the scale, character, form and proportions of the existing building.
12. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Other Matters

13. The proposal would provide increased and enhanced accommodation for the occupiers and the development would utilise sustainable materials and include the incorporation of solar panels. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have found and as noted by the proposed alternative scheme and the previous planning approval (Council reference 20/P/02025) there are other ways the property could be extended.

Conclusion

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

G Ellis

INSPECTOR