



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2023

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/22/3308519

12 Hanbury Path, Sheerwater, Woking, Surrey GU21 5RB

- 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 Asif Gujeral against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2022/0478, dated 17 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "Front porch extension incorporating the existing front door and portico; at ground floor the enlargement of the existing bathroom; and at first floor the enlargement of the side bedroom 2 and addition of a bathroom to the existing rear bedroom 1."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch extension incorporating the existing front door and portico; at ground floor the enlargement of the existing bathroom; and at first floor the enlargement of the side bedroom 2 and addition of a bathroom to the existing rear bedroom 1 at 12 Hanbury Path, Sheerwater, Woking, Surrey GU21 5RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2022/0478, dated 17 May 2022, 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: 2141/DR/001/1/Rev 1 – Plans and Elevations as Existing; 2141/DR/001/1/Rev 1 – Plans and Elevations as Proposed and 2141/DR/003/1/Rev 0 – Site Plan as Existing.
 - 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) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be installed at first floor level in the south-east and north-west elevations as shown on Plan No 2141/DR/001/1/Rev 1- Plans and Elevations as Proposed.
 - 5) The high-level window in the south-east elevation, serving bedroom 3, as shown on Plan No 2141/DR/001/1/Rev 1 - Plans and Elevations as Proposed, shall have a minimum internal cill height of 1.7 metres above finished floor level.

Procedural Matters

2. I observed at the site visit that the extension granted planning permission under reference PLAN/2016 0219 & 0826 has now been constructed. The proposal relates to modifications to the constructed extension, and I have determined the appeal on this basis. I have removed the reference to the modifications of the constructed extension from the description in the banner heading as this is not in itself development and I have used this shorter description in my decision.
3. Two plans listed in Condition 2 above have the same drawing number. For the avoidance of doubt, I have included the title of each plan.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located in a residential area where houses are of a similar style and age. As I have outlined, the appeal property has already been extended to the side. Due to its modest width and as it is set back a significant distance from the front elevation, the existing extension appears subservient to the host building and is in keeping with the prevailing street scene.
6. The proposed side extension would result in a modest addition to the previously approved scheme. It would not involve any increase to the width of the side extension. Although the proposal would bring the two-storey extension further forward on the plot, it would still be set back by an adequate distance so that the proposed addition would not be out of scale, and would appear subservient to, the host dwelling.
7. Even though the roof would not be set down from the ridge line of the main house and the eaves would be higher than the existing eaves height, due to its modest scale the proposed roof form would not appear visually prominent or jarring. Rather it would appear subordinate to the main roof, would have an acceptable relationship with the host building and would be in keeping with the existing street scene.
8. The rear extension would also be modest in scale. It would introduce a small area of flat roof, but this would not be readily visible from the public realm and due to its limited scale, it would not appear incongruous. Similarly, the proposed porch would be appropriate in terms of scale and height with the appeal property and would not detract from the character and appearance of the area.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would comply with Policy CS21 of Woking Local Development Document – Woking Core Strategy October 2012 which seeks to ensure that new development respects and makes a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area. The development would comply with guidance contained in the Woking Design SPD February 2015 which seeks to ensure extensions should respect the existing building proportion, symmetry, balance and have an appropriate roof form. It

would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure development proposals are sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interest of certainty I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. To protect the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring the external materials to match those of the existing building. To protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents a condition is necessary to restrict new window openings in the south-east and north-west elevations. However, given the design of the extension, it is unnecessary to restrict window openings in the roof. To protect the living conditions of the residents of No 10 Hanbury Path a condition to ensure the high level window serving bedroom 3 has a minimum cill height is necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan and the Framework, and therefore the appeal is allowed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR