



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2025

by **N Perrins MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 11 March 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/24/3357599**

**Fermain, Greyfriars Road, Send, Surrey GU23 6JD**

- 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 Jake Joslin against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/P/01570.
  - The development proposed is a two storey side / rear extension with front dormer window and new entrance porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. I am aware that the planning application was amended during its determination period to remove a ground floor side window and to correct a minor drawing error. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal proposal using the latest set of drawings that the Council made its decision on.
3. The appellant refers to Policy H4 of the Guildford Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023 (DMP) as appearing to have been deleted. Policy H4 has been provided in the information provided and there is nothing before me that indicates it has been deleted. Accordingly, I have assessed the proposal against Policy H4, and other relevant policies and guidance, in this decision.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached bungalow located in a private cul-de-sac. The existing property has a traditional design with a modestly scaled and proportionate roof. This is in keeping with a street scene made up of dwellings that, even where extended, have mainly hipped and proportionately scaled roof forms.
6. I acknowledge that the appellant's intention is to largely maintain the western side of the property as it is today. However, the two-storey extension on the eastern side would appear as excessively large and out of scale with the rest of the property due to its bulk, mass and depth that would project a significant distance into the plot.

7. The flat roof design would also appear at odds with the prevailing hipped and ridged roof forms on other properties in the cul-de-sac. Taken together, the scale, flat roof form and excessive projection into the plot would create an unbalanced and overly large extension that would not be subservient or proportionate to the existing property. This would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the cul-de-sac.
8. I have also considered the property's position in the plot, its eastern side facing towards the rear of the neighbouring property and the proposed setting back of the two-storey element. These aspects, however, do not justify the harm identified as the proposal would still be prominently and incongruously visible within the cul-de-sac street scene due to its excessive scale and uncharacteristic roof design.
9. Whilst I have found there to be unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area from the two-storey element, the front porch would be acceptable. It would be a relatively minor change to the dwelling that would integrate successfully with the ground floor without causing any material planning harm. Finding no harm in this regard, however, does not justify the harm identified from the other parts of the proposal.
10. In conclusion and for the reasons stated, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area contrary to Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034, Policies H4 and D4 of the DMP, and Policy 1 of the Send Neighbourhood Plan 2021. These require development to achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character, respect existing context, scale, height, design appearance and character of the immediate surrounding area. The proposal would also not accord with Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

### **Other Matters**

11. Objections were received highlighting concerns with a potential loss of light. In view of the separation distances that exist, I agree with the Council's conclusions in this regard as set out in the officer's report.
12. I acknowledge that there is some support for the proposal. However, support for the proposal does not negate the need to assess the proposal's impact on the character of the area, which as discussed above would be adversely affected.
13. I also note the benefits that would arise from the inclusion of solar panels and being able to better meet the needs of existing and future occupants through the optimisation of density and internal flexibility. However, these do not outweigh the harm that would occur to the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, the proposal is not consistent with the policies of the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would lead me to a different conclusion. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

*N Perrins*

INSPECTOR