



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2022

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/21/3287707

2 Gwynne Court, Guildford, GU2 9LY

- 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 & Mrs Gavin Cooke against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/P/01114, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear dormer and loft conversion with three rooflights to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the interests of accuracy, I have used the Council's description of the proposed development seen in its decision notice rather than the description used in the application form.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

4. The host property is comprised within a modestly sized terrace of dwellings within a relatively modern housing estate. The terrace is punctuated by two substantial gables front and back, which adds form and design interest, particularly to the roof. The appeal property is set alongside one of the gables.
5. The proposed dormer would be shaped like a box. The appellant considers that the dormer has been 'sensitively designed'. I disagree. To my mind, the structure would appear crude in design terms and incongruous set against the angled gable, damaging the appearance of the host property and the roofscape of the terrace as a whole.
6. Whilst the dormer would be sited in the rear roof, it would nevertheless be prominent when viewed from Railton Road, which runs alongside Gwynne Court. It would also be clearly seen from Little Road across the open land surrounding the Army Cadet centre. The harmful incongruity of the

development would thus be plainly apparent from various vantage points in the public realm.

7. My visit took place when the trees in adjacent streets were in a defoliated state. Whilst some screening may be afforded when trees were in leaf, the dormer would nevertheless be clearly seen from several vantage points.
8. The appellant refers to several examples of what are claimed to be similar forms of development. During my visit, I noted that most of the roofscape in the surrounding area was free of dormer development of the type proposed here. Where dormers occurred, they appeared to me to be smaller and better designed than that proposed, and in a different visual context. The roof conversion in the same terrace, at No 4, is not comparable since it doesn't involve a dormer addition.
9. Other examples provided by the appellant, including that at 12 Whateley Close and 52 Forster Road¹, have also been taken into account. I note from the photographs provided that these appear to involve dormer additions not dissimilar to those proposed here. But the fact that this type of development may be acceptable elsewhere in a particular location does not, in itself, justify its acceptability everywhere, since circumstances vary. Accordingly, my judgement is based on the particular circumstances of this case, and specifically on its merits, as required.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of saved policies G5 & H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, or Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 directed to ensuring that new development should achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character.

Other matters

11. All other matters referred to in the representations have been taken into consideration, including the various references to the Guildford Supplementary Planning Document Residential Alterations and Extensions 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework, but no other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ Granted on appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/13/2199208