



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2022

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1ST September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3300278

Manaton, Mount Pleasant, West Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24 6BJ

- 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 G Burton against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/P/00117, dated 21 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to existing loft with addition of two dormers.
-

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 host pair of semi-detached dwellings and the character of the immediate surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Mount Pleasant is characterised by a broad range of detached and semi-detached bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey houses. The pairs of semi-detached dwellings are symmetrical in appearance and include a number of dwelling types and designs that are repeated within the road. This symmetry makes a strong contribution to the ordered and uncluttered character and appearance of the street scene.
4. The appeal dwelling comprises one of a pair of symmetrically designed semi-detached chalet bungalows. The pair of dwellings have fully hipped roofs; matching front projections with hipped roofs; and front dormer windows sitting alongside each other. To the rear they similarly have small projecting rear wings, although the adjoining dwelling, Elmside, also has a large flat roofed dormer window.
5. The rear garden of the appeal property abuts the rear gardens of the dwellings fronting onto Cranmore Lane, which are included in the West Horsley Conservation Area (WHCA). The WHCA encompasses the core of the village and includes a diverse range of buildings of different ages and constructed from a range of materials, including flint, brick, render exposed timber framing and plain clay tiles. The WHCA also includes farmland and farm buildings located to the west of The Street. This diverse mix of buildings and rural land, together

- with the abundance of trees, hedges, narrow roads and verges contribute to the varied rural village character, appearance and significance of the WHCA.
6. Together and amongst other things, paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), policy G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (LP) and policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2019) (LPSS), require new development to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture; maintain a strong sense of place; and respond to the distinctive local landscape character. Policy WH2 (ii) of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2016–2034 (NP) is consistent with this.
 7. Sections 1 and 3 of the Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD), state that the purpose of the guidance is to assist in the design of extensions and provides advice on ways to provide extra accommodation. It explains that the roof of a dwelling has a major impact on the dwelling’s character, which forms an important role within the street scene. The SPD advises that dormer roof extensions should normally be positioned to the rear of the property and should be sympathetic to the existing roof and the host property as a whole. They should normally be subordinate to the roof, sit below the ridge line and occupy no more than half the width or depth of the roof. The proposed fenestration should reflect the proportions and style of the existing windows and normally align with the windows below.
 8. The proposed rear dormer extension would be comparable in scale and position to the existing dormer extension to the rear of Elmside, although it would have a crown roof as opposed to a flat roof. The crown roof and walls of the proposed rear dormer would be clad in plain tiles to match and blend in with the existing roof. It would sit slightly below the main ridge line and both above and recessed back from the existing eaves line. The proposed rear dormer would be contained between the existing chimney and the rear projecting wing. Although not in alignment with those below, the proposed windows would respect the proportions and strong vertical lines of the existing windows.
 9. As a result of these factors, although the proposed rear dormer extension would exceed half the width of the existing roof, it would be visually contained and would respect and blend in readily with the roof-scape of the pair of dwellings. As stated in Section 1 of the SPD the borough is diverse and varied in character. Whilst the guidance indicates the most common planning and design considerations which should be taken into account, it cannot reflect every individual situation.
 10. Conversely, the proposed side dormer would project out from the main side roof-slope of the dwelling, to the rear of the hipped front projecting wing. As a consequence, it would dilute and detract from the existing roof design. In particular, it would detract from the detailing of the deep and wide main hipped roof, the roofline of the front projecting wing, the symmetry of the pair of dwellings and the uncluttered roof-scape within the immediate area.
 11. This harm would outweigh the benefits for the appellant and their family that would result from the proposed additional accommodation. Further, it is not something that could be adequately dealt with through the imposition of conditions.

12. It is acknowledged that a nearby dwelling has side facing dormers. However, this relates to a detached dwelling and the dormers are on both sides the roof-slope. As such the roof of the dwelling is symmetrical in appearance when viewed from Mount Pleasant.
13. Concerning the WHCA, Section 16 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, including its setting, great weight should be given to its conservation. Any harm resulting from development within its setting should require clear and convincing reasons.
14. The proposed dormer windows would be partially screened from the rear gardens of the adjacent dwellings in Cranmore Lane by mature planting and trees. They would be fully screened from Cranmore Lane by buildings, fences and planting. As such the proposal would preserve the WHCA and would not detract from its significance.
15. Finally, in view of my findings regarding the acceptability of the proposed rear dormer extension, I have considered the possibility of issuing a split decision. However, as the proposed dormer extensions are physically and functionally connected through the proposed internal layout, in this instance this is not possible.
16. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of dwellings and the immediate surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with LP Policy G5, LPSS Policy D1, NP Policy WH2 (ii), section 3.3 of the SPD and paragraph 130 of the Framework.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR