



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/W/20/3250267

100 Balmoral Drive, Woking, Surrey

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Zaheer Bashir against Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2019/1247, is dated 10 December 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "part single/double storey side extension single storey front extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for part single/double storey side extension single storey front extension is refused.

Main Issues

2. I have had regard to the Council's Statement of Case in determining the following main issues:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area;
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 49 Bassett Road, with particular reference to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The proposed two storey extension would project forward of the main front elevation of the existing dwelling by 2.5 metres. It would appear as a large addition to the dwelling, comprising of more than half the width of the existing dwelling. Whilst it has been designed with a lower ridge height, given its overall size, scale and siting forward of the front elevation, the extension would not appear subservient to the host dwelling.
4. Furthermore, the proposed two storey extension would not appear well integrated with the host dwelling. In terms of its appearance, the extension would lack balance and design detailing with large expanses of largely unbroken brickwork. The stepped design of the two storey extension would also result in an awkward roof form which would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the host dwelling. The proposed extension would also be highly

prominent in the street scene and due to its design and overall size, scale and siting, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Whilst the single storey elements of the proposal would be less prominent in the street scene, I agree with the Council that the hipped roof forms would appear out of character with the gabled form of the existing dwelling.

5. I conclude that for the above reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) which collectively require development to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area and to conserve and where possible enhance townscape character. The proposal also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be of a high quality design and to respect existing character.

Effect on living conditions

6. A first floor bedroom window is proposed on the rear elevation of the two storey side extension. Whilst the rear garden boundary between the application site and 49 Bassett Road tapers and is at an angle to the extension, this window would nonetheless be close to the boundary with No 49 and would allow for relatively unrestricted views into the rear garden area of that property. Accordingly, the proposal would have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 49 Bassett Road due to loss of privacy.
7. The proposal would be contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) which among other matters, seeks to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy.

Conclusion

8. The harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area together with the harm the proposal would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of 49 Bassett Road leads me to conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. In accordance with S38(6) of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 development which conflicts with the development plan should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. There are no material considerations of such weight to lead me to the conclusion that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
9. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

J Davis

INSPECTOR