



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2019

by Thomas Bristow BA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/19/3237931

59 Caillard Road, Byfleet, West Byfleet KT14 7JA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs J Percy against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2019/0241, dated 7 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a 'double storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension at 59 Caillard Road, Byfleet, West Byfleet KT14 7JA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref PLAN/2019/0241, dated 7 March 2019, subject to the conditions below.

Policy context

2. In summary, policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (adopted 25 October 2012 and subsequently reviewed, the 'CS'), along with paragraph 127(a) and (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') seeks to ensure that all development is sympathetic to local character and design. That is an approach reiterated in the National Design Guide, notably via sections C1 and I1 (published 1 October 2019, 'NDG'). There is no indication that neighbourhood planning work being undertaken by the Byfleet Residents Neighbourhood Forum is yet to reach a stage such that it may be accorded significant weight.
3. The Council have also cited conflict with the approach in their Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 12 February 2015, the 'Design SPD') and also in the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy Supplementary Planning Document (adopted originally in 2008). The Council's officer report associated with application Ref PLAN/2019/0241 states that the former sets out how 'significant extensions to the street façade will usually be resisted where there is a well established building line... extensions should not result in unbalanced or disproportionate frontages.'
4. The latter document, however, addresses principally matters related to the living conditions of those potentially affected by development. The Council's decision notice of 3 September 2019 raises no objection to the scheme on the basis of its implications for the amenity of those nearby. Given the separation between, orientation relative to, and presence of only two modest obscure-glazed first floor windows in the facing elevation of the nearest neighbouring

property (No 61), along with the scale of the proposal, I am also not of the view that undue effects to the living conditions of those nearby would result.

Main issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and locality.

Reasons

6. No 59 is an end-of-terrace property, attached to No 57. It occupies an irregular plot, with a side elevation facing toward Caillard Road at an angle, in between which there is a detached garage. As aptly described by the Council, No 59 is part of a 'horseshoe' of ten similar properties, arranged in three terraces set at right angles to one another. Those properties were evidently constructed at a similar time and to a similar design, potentially Edwardian, potentially inter-war. I acknowledge that they are therefore of some local historic interest, albeit representative of a relatively common typology and are not subject to formal protection.
7. Nos 41 to 59, along with many others in the surrounding area, are relatively modest dwellings featuring early twentieth detailing and materials. No 59, as with No 41, has a prominent two storey gable element, a cat-slide roof form, and comparatively low eaves. Other nearby properties share a relatively steep roof pitch. Principal elevations are broadly symmetrical. Dwellings in this area typically feature gabled or flat-roofed dormer windows of differing sizes projecting above eaves to varying degrees. Properties also tend to be set in similarly-sized plots and to a broadly consistent building line, reflecting the coherent historic development of the area.
8. I was unable to identify many nearby properties whose roof form has been significantly altered over time.¹ I noted, however, that the roofs of more recent properties are, on occasion, visible in-between properties along Caillard Road (such as those along neighbouring Campbell Close and Petersham Avenue). A traditional palette of external materials predominates, chiefly russet roof tiles paired with natural-coloured or painted render. Some properties have been altered to reflect changing preferences over time, for example via the creation of porches, garages and replacement of original window units.
9. The proposal is to create a two storey side extension projecting towards Caillard Road, with accommodation at first floor level within the roof pitch. That, I accept, would represent a substantial addition to the existing property, measuring some 3.6 metres in width and 6.9 metres in depth. As shown on plan '01' (Job No. 1492) that would add to the visual bulk of No 59, disrupt the broad symmetry currently present in the eastwards-facing elevation, and be readily apparent on account of the relationship of the property and its plot to Caillard Road as described above. The Council's position in respect of the impact of the proposal on character in the officer report is well-articulated.²

¹ Noting that the examples brought to my attention by the appellant along Oyster Lane, all of which I viewed during my site visit, fall within an area with a more variable character featuring more modern development.

² There is also no argument made that the development proposed would be similar to that which could be undertaken via permitted development rights (noting the limitation of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, A.1(e)(ii) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended.

10. However the maximum ridge height proposed would be lower than that of No 59 as it stands. The extension proposed would be set back some 0.62 metres from the line of the eastwards-facing elevation. At ground floor level No 59 also includes a porch, garage, and there is an established hedgerow flanking the pavement. Taken together those features would either ensure some degree of subservience to the host property or serve to limit the extent of visual change resulting from the scheme. Moreover No 59 is very much seen in the context of neighbouring properties; viewed relative to a terrace of properties the extension proposed would not, in my view, be seen as unduly bulky or excessive.
11. Plan '01' shows how the eaves, window detailing, and materials proposed would tie in well with those features of the existing property. There are a range of roof forms nearby; simple dual-pitched, half-hipped, and as noted above, variety in the design and scale of dormers and visibility of modern roof forms along neighbouring roads. That surrounding context is therefore not so sensitive that a reasonable degree of change could not be accommodated.
12. Adherence to the plans and using matching materials could be secured via appropriately worded conditions. Owing to the atypical plot shape and offset of the side elevation of No 59 to Caillard Road, the extension would broadly align with the building line of the terrace of Nos 61 to 67 rather than appear discordant or dominant; a relationship shown in the layout plan under paragraph 5.15 of the appellant's statement of case. That layout plan also shows that the minimum separation distance between the extension proposed and boundary would be around 1.28 metres, in excess of the minimum one metre gap I understand is recommended in the Design SPD.
13. The proposal would undoubtedly result in some change, albeit that the form of the original property would still be readily identifiable and not so fundamentally altered so as to efface its historic interest. Whilst a significant extension, the proposal would inevitably be viewed in the context of the terrace of properties of which No 59 is part against a varied context of roof forms, and some alterations to nearby properties over time. In that context it would not be disproportionate nor incongruous. I therefore conclude that, on account of the specific nature of No 59, its context and the development proposed, no conflict arises with the relevant provisions of CS policy CS21 of NPPF paragraph 127 (with regard to relevant elements of the Design SPD and NDG).

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, the approach in the NPPF, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out below. In addition to securing commencement within the relevant statutory period, I have imposed conditions requiring compliance with the supporting plan and that matching materials as in the existing building are used. They are necessary to ensure the proposal is implemented as assessed above, and thereby integrates suitably with local character and appearance.

Thomas Bristow

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF 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 approved pan '01' (Job No. 1492).
- 3) 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.