
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020

by Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/19/3242372

29 Beaufort Road, Maybury, Woking, Surrey GU22 8BZ

- 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 Mrs Navida Ali against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2019/0784, dated 22 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development of the dormer window was complete. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormer window on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located on the north-west side of Beaufort Road. The area is characterised by mainly two-storey semi-detached and short terraced rows of properties.
5. Part 9D of the Woking Design Supplementary Planning Document, February 2015 (SPD) states that permission will usually be granted for the installation of traditional dormer windows if they are a subordinate feature of the roofscape and are in keeping with the character of the dwelling and street scene.
6. I saw on my site visit that dormer windows on the front elevation of properties in the vicinity of the appeal site are not a feature of the street scene and the few that I saw are positioned only at first floor level. Thus, the dormer window, which is positioned within the roof slope, is a feature not in keeping with the character of the street scene.
7. The dormer window is substantial, being set down slightly from the ridge of the roof and near flush with the principal front elevation at eaves level. Its size, in combination with its off-centre position within the roof slope, results in an incongruous addition that dominates the roof, fundamentally altering its shape

and unbalancing its form and appearance. Consequently, it does not amount to a subordinate addition to the host property.

8. As a result of the layout of development the principal elevation of the appeal property does not face directly towards the street. Consequently, the dormer window is not visible in views looking north-east along Beaufort Road. Nonetheless, the resulting significant adverse effect of the dormer window on the character and appearance of the dwelling and street scene is readily visible in public views from the gentle bend in Beaufort Road adjacent to the appeal site and in views looking west and south-west along Beaufort Road. Overall, although constructed in matching materials, the dormer window harms the contribution the property makes to the street scene.
9. My attention has been drawn to other dormers in the surrounding area. The circumstances in each case are likely to be different, and in any event the fact that apparently similar dormers may have been permitted is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it causes harm for the reasons set out above.
10. For the reasons outlined above, the dormer window unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it conflicts with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, Part 9D of the SPD, and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, set out to ensure development respects and makes a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area in which it is situated.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR