

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/21/3287161

8 Winnington Way Woking, Surrey GU21 3HL

- 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 Iftekhar Qasim against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref. PLAN/2021/0825, dated 11 August 2021 was refused by notice dated 6 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey front, side and rear extensions; roof extensions and alterations including raising of the ridge height to facilitate second floor accommodation, a rear dormer window and front rooflights, front porch and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings, and (ii) the living conditions for the occupiers of adjoining occupiers as regards outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is part of the Goldsworth Park Estate development in which the houses share characteristics in terms of their scale, design and external materials. This inevitably imposes constraints on the form and extent of any additions and alterations, so as to avoid harm to the existing pleasing street scene in which the staggered building line follows the curve of the road into Glendale Close.
 4. The appeal dwelling is tightly positioned in relation to No. 6 but any perception of the development pattern being cramped is offset by No. 6 being set back from No. 8 and by the gap between Nos. 8 and 10 at first floor and roof level, which allows views from Winnington Way to the trees to the rear.
 5. Given these factors, I consider that whilst subject to the Council's views there may in principle be some scope for the appeal dwelling to be extended, it is essential in the interests of maintaining the spacious character and pleasing appearance of the road that any additions are subordinate to the existing dwelling. This would enable the ethos of the original development to be
-

retained, namely family houses with a variety of appearances and sitings but nonetheless maintaining the broadly consistent character of the original estate development.

6. However, the appeal scheme would fail to do this because with the proposed two storey extensions to three of its elevations and a crown roof to achieve three floors of accommodation it would appear as an overly bulky building for its plot and setting and incongruous in the street scene. The significant reduction in the gap between Nos. 8 and 10 at first floor and roof level would be particularly harmful, as together with No. 6 and its close proximity to the host dwelling the spacious setting and rhythm of this part of the estate would be lost.
7. Turning briefly to the second main issue, I consider that the occupiers of No. 10 would be the residents most affected because of this dwelling's position forward of No. 8. As the officer's report clearly explains, the combination of the scale of the proposed extension and the narrowing of the first floor gap between the dwellings would result in an unacceptable effect on light and outlook for the occupiers. The development would additionally affect the amenity of No.10's garden because of the increased enclosure, whilst the proposed dormer windows would lead to the occupiers of No. 26 Glendale Close being overlooked.
8. Overall, I conclude that because of the harm caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings and to the living conditions for adjoining occupiers as regards outlook, light and privacy, the proposed development is unacceptable.
9. As a consequence, the appeal scheme would conflict with Policies CS21 & CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012; the Council's SPDs in the form of 'Design' 2015 & 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' 2008, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's genuine desire for the house to be of a size suitable for his large family, but this does not justify the appeal dwelling being extended and altered to an extent that would be contrary to planning guidance and demonstrably harmful to the public interest. Furthermore, even if the proposal had been acceptable, it would have been difficult for me to grant permission on the basis of the submitted plans as they are of insufficient detail, clarity and accuracy for a development of this complexity.
11. For the reasons explained above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR