

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2016

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 03 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/16/3156698
16 Harvey Road, Guildford GU1 3SG

- 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 Imogen Abed against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/P/00524 was refused by notice dated 3 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is to demolish detached rear two storey annexe building, convert loftspace including new front and rear dormer windows, erect single storey rear extension and adapt/extend side porch and entrance steps.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to demolish detached rear two storey annexe building, convert loftspace including new front and rear dormer windows, erect single storey rear extension and adapt/extend side porch and entrance steps, at 16 Harvey Road, Guildford GU1 3SG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/P/00524, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 926/01, 926/02, 926/03 and 926/04.
 - 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.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the streetscene and the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two storey detached dwelling with an almost pyramidal roof form. The extensions to the roof at the front and rear would cover the full height and depth of the roof slopes with no gaps to the ridge or eaves. However, the scale of the extensions would be limited by not projecting above the ridge or beyond the walls below, while having significant space to the sides. The main roof slopes at the sides would be partly continued to the front and rear, reflecting the existing form. Moreover, the Appellant points out that the proposal would result in part of the main facade continuing upwards and being flush with the face of the front addition. The submitted loft floor plan shows
-

that this would be the case at both the front and rear. In consequence of these factors, the extensions would be integrated with the roof and main walls of the dwelling, rather than appearing as discrete additions. The extensions would therefore seem to be part of the original dwelling and not be incongruous, out of scale or overly dominant, with their bulk and mass not being excessive and no adverse effect on the roof profile.

4. While there are some relatively small dormer additions on the same side of the street, there is a hipped roof example which projects from the top of the main roof in a similar manner to those now proposed. There are also a significant number of front gable features of varying scales and proportions at other properties, which the new gable ended roof projections would reflect and be compatible with. There is also appreciable variation in the design of individual dwellings. In this context the roof extensions would not appear unduly prominent, while also adding visual interest to the otherwise fairly bland roofscape of the host dwelling. The impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, locality and streetscene would therefore be positive and not harmful.
5. Because of the absence of any adverse effect on the scale and character of the dwelling and on the context and character of the adjacent buildings and immediate surroundings, there would be compliance with these aims of Guildford Borough Local Plan (LP), adopted 2003, Policy H8. The development would respect the scale of the surrounding environment and roof treatment, in compliance with these intentions of LP Policies G5 (1) and G5 (2).
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): Residential Extensions 2003 suggests that loft conversions should not substantially increase the roof volume. An illustration of acceptable dormer windows shows significantly smaller additions than now proposed with significant gaps to the eaves. The SPG also advises that the purpose of a dormer window is to provide light and not to gain increases in floor area. The Council points out that the rear addition would be at odds with this advice by providing an en-suite shower room.
7. Nevertheless, the appearance of the extended dwelling, both in itself and in relation to its context, would be appropriate, so that due to the precise circumstances and absence of harm the Council's SPG should not be rigidly applied to this case. The core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and take account of the character of different areas would be satisfied.
8. The distance of the roof extensions from the dwelling at 18 Harvey Road would be sufficient to prevent any undue loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook. Taking account of all other matters raised, there are no considerations sufficient to justify rejecting the proposal given the absence of harm that would result and the appeal succeeds.
9. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. The facing materials used in the development should match those of the existing dwelling to protect its appearance.

M Evans

INSPECTOR