



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/19/3242052

3 Southcote, Horsell, Woking GU21 4QX

- 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 D Remsha against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2019/0827, dated 8 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side and front extension incorporating garage and new front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side and front extension incorporating garage and new front porch at 3 Southcote, Horsell, Woking GU21 4QX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2019/0827, dated 8 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: 01/REV FINAL, 02/REV 05, 04/REV 05, 05/REV 05, 06/REV 05, 07/REV 05, 08/REV FINAL, 09/REV 05, 10/REV 05 and 11/REV 05.
 - 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.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows at first floor level in the northwest side elevation have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the windows are installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Procedural matters

2. On the same day as refusing the appeal application, the Council granted a planning permission for "demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey extension, single storey front and side extension incorporating garage

and new front porch" (Council Ref: PLAN/2019/0821). The difference between that and the appeal proposal is that the appeal proposal would have a two storey front extension rather than it only being single storey as approved. Consequently, this appeal decision will concentrate on this element of the proposal, the remainder being considered acceptable by the Council. I have no reason to take a contrary view on the remainder of the proposal.

3. At the time of the site visit works were taking place at the property and the majority of the roof, including the area of the proposed extension, was covered in a "shroud". I am satisfied that I was able to see sufficient of the proposal and its relationship to the vicinity to determine its effects. In light of the building works it is reasonable to assume that the permitted works will be completed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located on rising ground with the property being above 1 Southcote and approximately one storey in height below No 5. Properties in the area are pre-dominantly detached and face the street. A number of the properties have been extended and some of the properties have dormer windows at first floor level. Some properties, such as the appeal property and the adjoining property to the northwest, No 5, have a single storey flat roof element on the front elevation.
6. The proposal is to construct, effectively, a first floor extension above this single storey element although this would be slightly wider than the existing element as the proposal would also involve extending the property by way of a two storey side extension and the proposal would 'line-up' with that side extension.
7. 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.
8. The SPD indicates that, in building form, any additional mass should respect the existing building proportion, symmetry and balance and, in relation to street scape, significant extensions to the street façade will usually be resisted where there is a well-established building line.
9. While the proposed extension would be relatively prominent due to its height and location on rising land, the proposal would remain set back from the highway and would respect the overall curve of this section of Southcote. Because of the change in level it would appear of similar height to the front element of No 5. By utilising a hipped roof away from the highway it would appear as a subservient element to the dwelling as permitted to be extended. It would not unbalance the property or the street scene or the area more generally. The disposition of the windows would follow the existing proportions

of the dwelling meaning that the resultant composition would be a coherent whole.

10. Consequently, the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the area more generally. It would therefore comply with Policy CS21 of the WCS and the SPD as set out above. It would also comply with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates planning decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

11. 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.
12. 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.
13. I have, finally, imposed a condition requiring that the three windows in the first floor side elevation facing No 5 are completed in obscure glazing in order to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of that property.
14. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision I have altered the conditions to better reflect the relevant guidance.

Conclusion

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

RJ Jackson

INSPECTOR