



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMi

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/19/3241468

32 Tresillian Way, Woking GU21 3DL

- 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 N Chapman against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2019/0820, dated 13 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground and first floor extensions at 32 Tresillian Way, Woking GU21 3DL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2019/0820, dated 13 August 2019 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1609 - LP01, 1609 FE03A, 1609 04A, 1609 FE06A, 1609 FE07A, 1609 FE09A, 1609 FE22A, 1609 FE23A, 1609 FE24A, 1609 FE25A, 1609 FE26A, 1609 FE27A, 1609 FE28A, 1609 FE29A and 1609 FE51.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in an area of housing constructed in the 1970s and 1980s. While the properties have a consistent approach to design, they are not homogenous in that there are bungalows and houses, detached, semi-detached and short terraces of buildings, and the building forms are varied with balconies, and short lean-to pitched roofs over single storey elements. There is also some variation in materials, although brick walls and tiled roofs predominate.

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a smaller single storey element on the eastern side. The proposal is for the addition of a first floor within an asymmetric roof with glazing facing to the rear, and a single storey rear extension adjacent to the adjoining property, No 31, with a mono-pitched roof with a ridge on this boundary.
5. On the other side of the appeal property is a public footpath through to a walkway around a lake. Beyond this footpath is another similar bungalow, 25 Willowmead Close, although this is set a short distance beyond a fence, further north and at an angle to the appeal property. This property has a conservatory on its rear elevation.
6. The Council has referred to its Supplementary Planning Document Design (2015) (the SPD). This, it is stated, is to provide design guidance and good practice to improve the quality of design in new development. As this is in line with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy October 2012 (the WCS), which requires development to create buildings that are attractive with their own distinct identity and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area, I am able to give the SPD significant weight.
7. The SPD indicates that in building form any additional mass should respect the existing building proportion, symmetry and balance and that the roof form should normally be of a similar format to that of the existing dwelling, and that roof forms that are contrary to existing roof form will generally be resisted.
8. Although slightly taller than the existing property the roof form of the property from the northeast would be similar to the current property. Because of the range of building heights in the area it would be in keeping with the existing variety of such heights and thus be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
9. From the rear and side, which could be readily seen from the public domain from the footpaths there, the roof form would not reflect the existing roof form with windows set below the ridge. While this would be contrary to the existing roof form, the proposal would change the overall aesthetic of the property from being a somewhat understated bungalow so that it would provide some presence and interest in the street scene.
10. The use of a mono-pitched roof on the rear extension would also not follow the prevailing roof pattern. However, this would not extend to the rear of No 31 and would appear as a subservient element within the overall design. In the wider street scene it would be seen against and in the context of that taller, two-storey property next door.
11. The Council considers that the proposal would be incongruous into the street scene. However, I disagree in that as an effective redesign of the whole property in a different aesthetic it would provide a focus and interest in the estate. It would be of lesser height than No 31, and with the use of matching materials would not appear intrusive in terms of height or design and would make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.
12. The Council is also concerned that the additional height would result in an oppressive environment for those walking on the public footpath between the appeal property and 25 Willowmead Close. While the proposal would increase the bulk adjacent to the footpath, because No 25 is set at an angle and some

way further to the north I am satisfied that there would be sufficient space between the two properties so that an oppressive environment would not result. I also note that other footpaths between properties have two-storey properties on either side, such as between 29 and 31 Willowmead Close, so that there is no requirement that such a footpath can only have bungalows on either side.

13. While the proposal would not follow the character and appearance of the existing property and in particular its roof form, and thus would be contrary to the terms of the SPD, I am satisfied that the resulting property would be in keeping with the overall character and appearance of the area and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy CS21 of the WCS as set out above. It would also comply with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.
15. I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials are to match those of the existing property to ensure that the proposal is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

RJ Jackson

INSPECTOR