
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2019

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/19/3236853

7 Mandeville Close, Guildford GU2 9YA

- 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 Panos Alexandropoulos against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/P/01267, dated 17 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is raising of roof ridge and extension to the rear, creation of rear dormer, 2 storey extension, rooflights installation to front roof elevation and single rooflight on dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The decision notice referred to an emerging local plan. However, the Guildford borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015 – 2034 (LPSS) is now adopted. I have therefore determined the appeal having regard to the LPSS and saved policies in the Guildford Borough Local Plan (LP) (2003). Following the determination of the application subject to this appeal, a scheme at the attached property, 5 Mandeville Close (No 5), was dismissed¹.
3. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the implications of these on the appeal and I am satisfied that no interested party has been prejudiced by this approach. Where any comments have been received, they have been taken into account in my reasoning.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. There is a partially staggered building line and some difference between ridge levels in the street. Nonetheless, the scale, design and proportions of the appeal site (No 7) and 5 Mandeville Close reflect that of the other pairs of semi-detached properties in the street. While there are properties of a different

¹ APP/Y3615/D/19/3229653

design in the surrounding area, there is a general consistency to the appearance of those in Mandeville Close.

6. The proposal would increase the height of the main roof at No 7 and set its ridge further back than that at No 5. While the roof enlargement would utilise matching external materials, the difference within the pair would be discordant with the pattern of the street where pairs of properties have roofs of the same height and form.
7. From my observations on site and the evidence before me, there is a consistency to the rear roofscape and no examples of dormers. The dormer would only be marginally set in from the roof boundaries and would fill much of the enlarged rear part of the roof. It would be a bulky addition and introduce an uncharacteristic large flat roof element to the main roof. As a result, it would dominate the nearby roofscape and erode the existing uniformity to the roofscape in the street.
8. There are trees to the rear of the lane behind No 7 that would help screen the proposal from longer range views. Nonetheless, with No 7 being set further forward than the adjacent pair of properties the incongruity of the enlarged roof and uncharacteristic dormer would be clearly seen from the street. The discordance of these features would also be obvious from nearby properties and the lane to the rear of the site.
9. There is greater variation to the rear elevations of properties on this part of Mandeville Close with examples of single and 2 storey extensions. The rear extension would not be of an excessive scale and materials would match the existing dwelling. Consequently, this element of the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Nonetheless, the roof alterations and dormer would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy D1 of the LPSS and saved Policy G5(1) of the LP, which, amongst other things, seek that all new development will be designed to reflect the distinct local character of the area and respect established street patterns. The scheme would fail to accord with guidance in the SPD² where it states that extensions or alterations should normally be consistent with the existing building and that dormer roof extensions should normally be subordinate features to, and not occupy more than half the width or depth of, the roof.

Other Matters

11. The refusal reasons do not relate to the impacts of the scheme on the living conditions of nearby properties and I note there have been no objections from the adjacent properties. Nonetheless, the lack of harm and objection are neutral factors.
12. My attention has been drawn to other developments in the wider area. While there are some similar aspects to the appeal scheme, none of these would be viewed with No 7. Moreover, I do not have full details of these schemes and in any event I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

² Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD) (2018)

13. The appellant suggests that due to roof construction height, increasing the ridge height is the only way to create habitable accommodation that complies with building regulations and that the additional space is proportionate to the size of the existing house. Nonetheless, and while the proposal would create additional accommodation within this family home, these factors do not justify or outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. Therefore, for the above reason, and having taken into consideration all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR