



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by D Marley BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 NOVEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/25/3370703

25 Burnet Avenue, Guildford, Surrey GU1 1YD

- 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 Moutarde against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/00409.
 - The development is described on the application form as 'Proposed rendering to ground floor extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed rendering to ground floor extension at 25 Burnet Avenue, Guildford, Surrey GU1 1YD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/P/00409, and the plans numbered P.01, P.02, P.03, P.04, P.05, P.06, the Location Plan, and the Block/Site Plan.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states that the development was completed in January 2025. I saw on my site visit that the development had already taken place and appeared to accord with the plans before me. Therefore, I am considering the appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The property at 25 Burnet Avenue is an existing residential dwelling with red brickwork and tiling primarily used as elevational treatments. The dwelling includes a ground floor extension constructed under a recent planning permission. Nearby dwellings on Burnet Avenue feature similar brickwork and tiling. In close proximity to No 25 is the residential street of Oak Tree Gardens, where elevational treatments to residential dwellings are primarily brick, render and timber.
5. Whilst the application of render to the extension is different to the prevailing red brickwork and tile treatments at No 25, the ground floor extension is nevertheless subservient to the wider dwelling. The more recent nature of the extension is clearly apparent. The application of render provides a natural contrast between the extension and dwelling which, though visible from the street, does not detract from the dwelling's original features. With reference to the Residential Extensions and

Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (the 'SPD'), the use of render on the extension provides a complementary material to the prevailing brick and tile treatment at No 25. Therefore, the rendering of the extension does not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host property.

6. The street scene at No 25 is influenced by both nearby dwellings along Burnet Avenue, as well as the dwellings on Oak Tree Gardens. Residential dwellings on Oak Tree Gardens, with their mixed elevational treatments, are clearly apparent from a variety of views towards No 25. Although Oak Tree Gardens is a separate street to Burnet Avenue, the dwellings on Oak Tree Gardens nevertheless exert influence upon the character of other dwellings in their vicinity, including that of No 25. In this context, the render applied to the ground floor extension of No 25 is experienced as part of a varied material palette that includes similar treatments on nearby residential dwellings within the street scene. The rendered extension therefore does not appear unacceptably prominent or out of place. In line with the SPD, the rendering draws from local features and respects the context and character of the existing street scene.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the rendering of the ground floor extension does not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034, Policies D4 and H4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies, and Policy B-FD 1 of the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2035. Amongst other matters, these policies seek to deliver high quality design that contributes to local distinctiveness and responds positively to, and respects, both local character and that of the existing property.

Other Matters

8. Whilst noting the retrospective nature of the development, I am mindful that retrospective applications can be an appropriate method to regularise development that has already occurred. In any event, I have assessed the development on its own individual circumstances and have found no conflict with the Development Plan. The development's retrospective nature weighs neutrally in my decision.

Conditions

9. As the development is complete, it is not necessary to impose a time limit condition nor a condition requiring conformance with approved plans. Equally, given the nature of the appeal, it would not be reasonable to impose a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D Marley

INSPECTOR