

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 24 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/16/3161015

4 Louis Fields, Fairlands, Guildford, Surrey, GU3 3JG

- 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 Mark Strudwick against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/P/01257, dated 12 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is rooms in roof space and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 4 Louis Fields is a brick built detached bungalow with a hipped roof with the ridge running perpendicular to the street and two bay windows at the front. It is in an established residential street characterised by bungalows of similar construction, style and original roof form with variations in detailing such as pronounced front gables.
4. Policies relevant in this case include saved policies G5 and H9 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (the local plan) which relate to the design of development in general and the impact of residential extensions on, among other things, the scale and character of the building and the surroundings.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance *Residential Extensions* 2003 (the SPG) states that loft conversions should not substantially increase the roof volume, with natural light being provided by roof lights. It allows for dormer windows provided they are sympathetic in size and design to the property and are used to provide light rather than an increase in floor area. They should normally have pitched roofs.
6. I consider that the proposed dormer windows would adversely affect the scale and character of the existing building and the character of the wider street scene because of their size, bulk, form and location. Each of the dormers would appear as large, bulky additions to the roof which would unbalance the existing symmetry and original form of the roof and of the building as a whole. Their

cumulative effect would be to render the building top heavy and as a highly visible and incongruous feature in the street scene.

7. I saw during my visit that some of the bungalows along the street have been extended at roof level with dormers, most notably at No. 3, which has a large dormer to the side with a part flat, part pitched roof and at No. 8, with two side dormers and No. 33 with one side dormer. Apart from these, most of the properties are largely unaltered at roof level, except for several which have roof lights at the side and/or front.
8. In my view, the large dormer at No. 3 and, to a lesser extent, the smaller ones at Nos. 8 and 33, do not make a positive contribution of the appearance of these properties because of their form and location and, especially in the case of that at No. 8, their overall size.
9. I conclude that the proposed dormer windows would harm the character and appearance of the area because their scale and design would be out of keeping with the existing bungalow and the surrounding area. The proposal would be contrary to local plan policies G5 and H9 and the advice in the SPG.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR