



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/19/3235504

38 Veryan, Woking, GU21 3LL

- 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 Pawel Sadowski against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2019/0386, dated 13 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension at 38 Veryan, Woking, GU21 3LL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2019/0386, dated 13 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Location Plan, Drawing Nos 0-1, 5 (insofar as it relates to the internal accommodation, with the exception of the windows in the side of the property), 6, 7, 8, and 9.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. I have used the slightly amended description of development provided by the Council for clarity.
4. There is some inconsistency with the submitted plans, the floor plans show two side elevation windows which are not shown on the elevation drawing. Given this and that interested parties may consider that the proposal does not include side windows, I have based my consideration on the basis that no side windows are proposed. It is clearly open for the appellant to contact the Council in the first instance in the event that he requires windows in the side elevation.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

6. Veryan is a small cul de sac, located within a wider modern housing estate within the north-west suburbs of Woking. The estate is a pleasant, quiet development which is characterised by mostly two storey traditionally designed semi-detached or detached dwellings, of similar scale and design, with off road parking and detached garages. There is some variety provided by a differing brick finishes and set-backs, front porches, and ridge heights, however, there is a clear and consistent architectural character apparent with a variety of building lines.
7. The appeal dwelling, No. 38, is located at one end of the cul de sac, and is one of a terrace of three dwellings, with a further three attached to the rear (as back-to-back dwellings). The front elevation of the appeal property is set behind that of its immediate attached neighbour, No. 36.
8. Whilst the proposal would extend the property up to the front elevation of this neighbour and would not be subordinate to the host property, its design and detailing would reflect that of the existing dwelling and its attached neighbours. The depth of the extended dwelling, taken with its neighbouring dwelling to the rear would be similar to that of No 29 at the opposite end of the terraces with its neighbour No 34 and the uniform building line of the terrace that would result would reflect that of Nos 44 and 46 on the opposite side of the road. The general character and appearance of the dwelling would not therefore materially change and the contribution the dwelling makes to the terrace and wider area would be maintained.
9. Although the appearance of the side elevation and roof form of the dwelling would change, this would only be apparent in close proximity to the dwelling from the access to the side of the dwelling and brief glimpses over a fence along Cardingham. This change would not be prominent in the wider street scene nor estate. The minor visual impact of this would not be sufficient to result in the extension dominating or substantially compromising the existing character of the property or the wider area.
10. As such, it is concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area, and therefore I see no conflict with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), or the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 127), which collectively require development to achieve high quality design which makes a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area.
11. The Supplementary Planning Document Woking Design (2015) is referred to by the Council. However, it is a lengthy document and I have not been directed to a particular part of it so have not been able to take it into account in my consideration of this appeal.

Other Matters

12. I note the representations made about possible disturbance during the construction of the extension. However, such disturbance is likely to be

temporary and for a short period of time. It would not be reasonable to withhold the granting of planning permission for such reasons. It is noteworthy that the Council did not raise this as a concern when it refused the planning application.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a number of conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was allowed. To ensure that the development is carried out as approved, a condition requiring that it is undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings is necessary. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition controlling external materials is also necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed with the suggested conditions.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR