

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2017

by Ray Wright BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: Wednesday 1 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/16/3163608

104 Dartnell Park Road, West Byfleet KT14 6QD

- 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 Chris Dawe against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2016/0852 was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is to 'demolish existing porch and replace. Demolish existing conservatory and build new two storey rear extension. Build new pitched roof above garage.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing porch and its replacement, demolition of an existing conservatory and erection of a new two storey rear extension and a new pitched roof above garage at 104 Dartnell Park Road, West Byfleet KT14 6QD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2016/0852, dated 21 July 2016, 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: L/1316- 20, 21, 42, 45A, 46, and 47.
 - 3) Notwithstanding any indication otherwise shown on the approved plans listed within this notice the first floor level window(s) within the east and west (side) elevation(s), hereby permitted, shall be glazed entirely with obscure glass and non-opening unless the parts of the window(s) which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the room(s) in which the window(s) are installed. Once installed the window(s) shall be permanently retained in that condition.

Procedural Matters

2. Saved Policy HSG23 of the Woking Local Plan 1999 contained in the Council's decision letter has been superseded and is no longer extant, following the adoption of the Woking 'Development Management Policies' (DMP) in October 2016. It is consequently no longer relevant to this appeal.
 3. The appellant has confirmed that drawing no L/1316-46 correctly identifies the materials to be used in this proposal and, as such, supersedes drawing L/1316-43. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
-

Main issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect on the host property and the wider character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a detached two storey dwelling with attached single storey garage to the side, a rear extension and rear conservatory. It is located in an area characterised by similar detached houses in spacious plots with landscaped settings. The proposal has a number of different elements. A two storey rear extension, a new front porch, a mono pitch roof above the garage, alterations to fenestration and a change to external materials. The Council raise no objection to the replacement of the front porch or to the major part of the rear extension. Due to their design and form, I have no reason to disagree with these assessments.
6. At the site visit I noted the neighbouring property at no 106 appears to have been recently redeveloped and has a double gable frontage. The property at no 102 also appears to have been the subject of major changes and a number of other dwellings in the area appear to have been the subject of various extensions and alterations.
7. The proposed rear extension would project around 1.2 metres beyond the existing eastern side flank wall of the main house. As such, it would be visible from the public realm. However, this element would be set back a considerable distance from the road frontage. The appellant indicates it to be around 14 metres. Views would be further limited by the existing properties and boundary vegetation. In this position, to my mind, it would not form an unduly prominent or dominant feature within the wider street scene. To the rear the proposed projection would be hard to distinguish from the remainder of the extension and would have minimal impact on the overall appearance of the extension from adjoining dwellings.
8. The proposed mono-pitch roof to the garage would replace an existing flat roof and rise to eaves level of the dwelling. It would enclose a section of the current open area above the garage, but the current flat roof allows views of the rear annexe beyond and this alteration would beneficially improve the overall appearance of the main front elevation of the property. Its height and form would ensure the current spaciousness between the existing properties would not be unduly harmed. This alteration would also further limit any visual impact of the rear extension.
9. The appeal property is faced by red brickwork, with tile hanging and a tiled roof and these materials predominate in the wider area. However, the form and materials of houses in the area is not uniform with different shades of similar materials evident and, as highlighted by the appellant, examples of rendering, slate roofs etc. apparent in the wider area.
10. Consequently, while the current appearance of the house would be considerably altered it would not, to my mind, present an unduly stark appearance, and the proposed rendered walls, slate roof and associated grey brickwork and windows would not be out of keeping within the wider area. The Council highlight the proposed render at first floor level on the west elevation. However, this would only be seen from limited viewpoints between the existing houses, and its

expanse divided by the retained brick chimney. As such, this element would not be an overly conspicuous feature.

11. Although the changes would be clearly recognisable, I conclude the overall development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the property or wider area. As such there would be no material conflict with the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, or The Woking Design Supplementary Planning Document 2015.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

13. The Council put forward 3 conditions should the appeal succeed. The standard commencement condition is required and a condition referring to the relevant plans is also necessary for certainty. In addition to protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers the proposed condition relating to obscured glazing is reasonable in this case.

Ray Wright

INSPECTOR