
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by Christopher Thomas BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/17/3180435
64 Broadway, Knaphill, Woking, GU21 2RH

- 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 Ms Marleen Naessens against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2017/0294, dated 15 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension and single storey rear extension. Addition of Velux roof windows to front roof plane. Re Application: PLAN/2016/1412
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey rear extension and single storey rear extension. Addition of Velux roof windows to front roof plane. Re Application: PLAN/2016/1412 at 64 Broadway, Knaphill, Woking, GU21 2RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2017/0294, dated 15 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
 - 4) The roof lights in the north-east and south-west roof slopes hereby permitted shall have a minimum internal cill height of 1.7 metres above finished floor level.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. The host building is a modest sized bungalow with a dual pitched roof and a single storey extension at the rear. The loft space has also been previously converted to form an additional room and bathroom. The existing building has

little architectural merit or significant features which are worthy of retention, except for its distinctive bungalow appearance in a street scene which is dominated by two storey houses.

4. The proposed extensions to the host building are at the rear and apart from the additional Velux windows in the front roof plane its appearance from the road would be unaffected.
5. The design of the proposed extensions would lead to varied eaves levels and roof forms, including a crown roof. However, I consider that despite some lack of conformity with the existing roofscape at the rear of the building the proposal would not be as incongruous in its appearance as the Council argues. The proposed pitched and gabled roofs would still have some commonality with the main structure, albeit as part of a modern addition which would provide the expanded accommodation sought by the appellant. The basic shape and form of the original building would still be recognisable from the front and sides and to that extent the proposal would respect its original character. The Council's supplementary Planning Document 'Design' (2015) expects that the roof of an extension should normally be of a similar format to that of the existing dwelling, and that non-conforming roofs will generally be resisted. In this instance, I consider that the degree of non-conformity between the existing and the proposed would not be unacceptably harmful to the host building's character and appearance.
6. In terms of scale, I consider the proposed extensions would be on the limit of what would be acceptable, bearing in mind the relatively modest size of the original building with the existing single storey extension. Having said that, I consider the proposed extensions would not be disproportionately bulky or dominate the existing building. I have also taken into account the relationship the extended building would have to its surroundings and in particular its setting within a row of two storey houses. In this context however, I consider that even though the proportions of the proposed extensions in relation to the existing building would be on the margin of acceptability they would not relate to an unsatisfactory degree to the host building or nearby properties.
7. I conclude that the character and appearance of the host building would not be unacceptably harmed by the proposal. The requirement of paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to achieve high quality and inclusive design would not be undermined by the different roof styles or scale of the proposed extensions. Furthermore, I consider that there would be no conflict with the thrust of Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 which seeks to secure good design which has due regard to characteristics of adjoining land.
8. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition in respect of matching materials will protect the character and appearance of the building and safeguard visual amenity. The Council has also suggested the imposition of a condition regarding the minimum internal cill height of 1.7 metres above finished floor level of the roof lights in the north-east and south-west roof slopes, in the interests of safety, which I consider is necessary.

C Thomas INSPECTOR