



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2020

by Andrew Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/20/3254327

2 Downsvie Avenue, Kingfield, Woking GU22 9BT

- 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 Sajaad Ahmed against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2020/0261, dated 18 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is extension of roof structure to form additional accommodation and alterations to previously approved plans.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for extension of roof structure to form additional accommodation and alterations to previously approved plans at 2 Downsvie Avenue, Kingfield, Woking GU22 9BT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2020/0261, dated 18 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following submitted plans: Site Plan, Block Plan, 32/18 and 32/18/1.
 - 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 first floor windows in the rear elevation hereby permitted shall be glazed entirely with obscure glass and non-opening unless the parts of the windows which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed. Once installed the windows shall be permanently retained in that condition unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Preliminary Matter

2. At my visit I saw that the alterations to the rear dormer had already been carried out. These include the formation of roof pitches over the flat roof and alterations to windows. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupants of No. 2 Westfield Close.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is located on a cul-de-sac comprising mainly single storey detached dwellings, although many have been extended into the roof space. As a result, a significant number of dwellings along the road have front facing dormer windows, including Nos. 1 and 2a Downsview Avenue which are close to the appeal dwelling. These dwellings occupy plots that are wider than the appeal site and have an overall scale that is larger than the appeal dwelling. However, they share characteristics with the appeal dwelling such as their raised eaves and prominent first floor dormers.
5. The addition of a further dormer at the appeal dwelling and the associated extension of the roof would be visually acceptable in the context of these larger adjacent dwellings. I note that the gap between the extended appeal dwelling and its neighbour to the east would be reduced at first floor level as a result of the proposal, but there are a number of dwellings on the road with similar spacing. Furthermore, a reasonable gap between the sides of the two dwellings would be retained, enhanced by half gables, to the extent that the proposal would not have a cramped or overdeveloped appearance.
6. In addition to this, the extension would replace the existing visually weak arrangement whereby the northeast gable sits part way over the garage opening beneath. It would also replace the short length of roof facing the road, which looks poor when viewed from the side.
7. In summary, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area. It would accord with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 (WCS) and Woking Design SPD 2015, which among other things seek to ensure that development proposals are well designed.

Living conditions

8. The appeal dwelling lies broadly to the south of No. 2 Westfield Close, and at the eastern end of the plot it is close to the shared boundary between these dwellings. The extended roof would be easily seen from this close neighbour. However, in the context of the width of the existing roof and the dormer structure, the comparatively modest addition to the roof, which slopes away from the neighbour, would not have an overbearing impact on occupants of the neighbouring dwelling.
9. Owing to the slope of the roof and the orientation of the appeal dwelling, the effect of the proposal on light levels of the neighbouring plot would be limited, particularly as at the point closest to the extension the neighbouring garden extends away to the north. Furthermore, the neighbouring plot is more open in a west and south-westerly direction, and the proposal would therefore have no effect on daylight or sunlight levels reaching the neighbouring dwelling during the second half of the day.

10. The proposal would not result in any additional windows facing the rear, and a condition would ensure that it would not be possible for occupants to look towards the neighbour from these rooms. The effects of noise and dust during construction would be limited given the modest scale of the proposal.
11. In summary, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of No. 2 Westfield Road. It would accord with Policy CS21 of the WCS and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy & Daylight Supplementary Planning Document 2008, which among other things seek to ensure that development proposals avoid significant harm to adjoining properties.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the planning conditions that have been suggested by the Council and considered them against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty, and a condition to ensure that materials match to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the first-floor rear windows are obscure glazed and any opening parts are more than 1.7 metres above floor level to ensure that no overlooking can take place.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above, the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Tucker

INSPECTOR