



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/24/3357830

77 Wodeland Avenue, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4LA

- 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 & Mrs Davey against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/P/01100.
 - The development proposed was described as '*Erection of extensions and alterations*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for hip to gable roof enlargement, two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension, enlargement/ addition of front and rear dormer windows, addition of front rooflight and changes to fenestration following demolition of existing garage and side extension at 77 Wodeland Avenue, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/P/01100, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Drg Nos 1001-G100-P-00-01 Rev 02, 1001-G100-P-00-02 Rev 03, 1001-B500-EX-E-01 Rev 01, 1001-B500-EX-P-01 Rev 01, 1001-B500-PR-E-01 Rev 01, 1001-B500-PR-P-01 Rev 01 and 1001-B500-PR-P-02 Rev 01.
 - 3) 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The banner heading above uses a description for the development that was given on the application form. My formal decision uses the description which appears on the decision notice and which was repeated by the appellants on the appeal form. This gives an appropriately more accurate description for the proposed works.
3. In July 2021 planning permission (Ref 21/P/00823) was granted for works described as '*Construction of a single/double storey side extension with a pitched roof and gable end, single storey rear extension, enlargement of existing front and rear dormers and changes to rear fenestration following demolition of garage and side extension*'. During my visit I saw that works for this permitted scheme were underway. The appeal scheme is for a similar but materially different proposal and therefore I have considered the appeal as a proposed new development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling with a pyramidal shaped hipped roof and front two-storey gabled bay off-set to one side, originally with a single detached garage to the opposing side. Wodeland Avenue is entirely residential in character comprising mostly detached and semi-detached houses of various sizes and styles set behind reasonably shallow frontages and with a range of various sized gaps between. The proposal would include hip to gable changes to the sides of the existing roof, a two-storey side extension with a gabled side elevation, dormer windows to the front and rear roof slopes, and a single-storey rear extension that would project just over 4.2m beyond the original rear elevation and which would span across part of the new side extension and part of the original rear façade.
6. The extant planning permission includes a two-storey side extension with a gabled side elevation, dormer windows to the original and new front and rear roof slopes, and a single-storey rear extension that would project 3.9m beyond the original rear elevation and which would span across part of the new side extension and part of the original rear façade.
7. The Council has raised no concern with the size or appearance of the single-storey extension, or with the size and position of the dormer windows and other alterations and finishes. I agree that these elements would assimilate themselves comfortably into the site's context and wider setting. The two-storey side extension would mimic the form of the consented scheme with an appropriate level of subservience and a gabled roof that was previously considered to reflect the existing gabled roof features in the locality.
8. The Council recognises that properties along this part of Wodeland Avenue have varied roof forms. Whilst hipped roofs are most prevalent, gabled features are also commonplace and although there are some repeat designs to some dwellings, I could detect no particular rhythm or uniformity to the house styles that was important to the aesthetics of the street scene, particularly to the immediate locality of the appeal property along this side of the road. I am also mindful of the gabled form to the consented side extension, which would add to the mix.
9. The hip to gable changes would unquestionably add to the size of the dwelling's existing roofscape. However, to one side there would be little additional bulk over and above that of the consented two-storey side extension, which would fill much of the void which currently exists at this level.
10. The hip to gable on the opposite side would be a more pronounced change. However, the altered roof profile overall would be well-balanced and proportionate to the scale and appearance of the dwelling. There would be no change to either the dwelling's eaves line or maximum roof height. As such, I do not share the Council's view that the roofscape would appear overly large or dominant when compared with neighbouring dwellings. A shallow depth of flat roof would join the front and rear roof slopes but this would be largely hidden and only ever glimpsed from limited angles of upward looking sight in the gaps between neighbouring

properties. As such this element would be barely noticeable and not harmful to the appearance of the dwelling or wider street scene.

11. Overall, whilst the proposal would change the roof profile of the existing building, its remodelled appearance would be sympathetic in scale and form to the dwelling and would merely add to the existing variety of roof forms in the area. As such, I am satisfied that it would follow the guidelines for roof conversions contained within the Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD), adopted in 2018, appearing neither over dominant nor incongruous. In the absence of any harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property and wider street scene, there would be no conflict with Policies H4 and D4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies, adopted in 2023, or Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034, adopted in 2019, as far as between them they seek to ensure that development displays a high quality of design that respects and contributes to the existing context and local distinctiveness. For the same reasons I am satisfied that there would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

12. I have noted further comments received from neighbouring occupiers and other interested third parties. The Council has confirmed that the extension to the side of the appeal property would satisfy the SPD guidelines for assessing any impact upon levels of daylight to principal windows at No 75. Therefore, although the side extension would project forward of this neighbouring property, it would not do so to a degree that would have a harmful impact upon the neighbour's living conditions.
13. The property to the opposing side at No 79 has four windows and a glazed door to the flank elevation facing the appeal site. I agree that the increased height of the flank wall to No 77 would be likely to have some impact upon levels of daylight and sunlight currently received by these openings, especially at first-floor level. However, there is no evidence that any of these openings serve habitable rooms or that if they do, they are the sole source of light and outlook. Also, given the separation distance between the two dwellings that would remain, I share the Council's view that any impact would not be significant. As such, there would be no effect upon the living conditions at No 79 that would be harmful.
14. The rear facing dormer windows would offer sight directly over the rear garden of the appeal property and only obliquely over the middle to rear parts of neighbouring gardens in a manner that would be consistent with the existing pattern of local development. There would be no loss of existing levels of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.
15. Matters raised relating to construction noise and disturbance are regulated by other statutory controls.

Conditions

16. In addition to the standard time limit and plans conditions, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, a condition is required to ensure that the external materials used match those on the existing building.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR