



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3314579

29 Kings Road, West End, Woking GU24 9LN

- 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 Graham Kimber against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0452/FFU, dated 19 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is for alteration to roof including increase in ridge height, two storey front, side and rear extensions, side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development on the application form was lengthy and described a range of alterations to the property, not just the proposed development. The description above is therefore taken from the appeal form and decision notice which more concisely describes the development.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof, it has an attached canopy to the side and a flat roof garage setback. It is sited on the north side of Kings Road, an unmade residential road lined by a range of properties. Whilst the neighbours to either side of No.29 are also modest bungalows the properties further along the road are primarily two-storey.
5. The Council's Residential Design Guide SPD (2017) (RDG) provides guidance for extensions, including that they will be expected to be subordinate to, and consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the host building, and that roof forms should not diverge from the prevailing character, and flat roofs should not be used to span overly deep buildings.
6. The proposal would significantly alter the scale and appearance of the property with an increased depth and width, and completely change to the roof design. The front elevation would be brought forward and have a gabled form and the

extension to the rear would project to the side incorporating a garage. The alterations would be of a scale that would fully consume the existing bungalow. Currently, the property has an apex roof and whilst the increase in height would be limited the bulk of the roof would be significantly increased with the ridge line running from front to back. The height of the rear section is restricted through the utilisation of a crown roof, however, I tend to agree with the Council that this is a symptom of the disproportionate width of the extension rather than a design approach. The flat roof and large profiles of the dormer windows would create a relatively cluttered presentation to the road and the side elevations would have an excessive depth and would be primarily blank facades.

7. The appellant has referred to various other properties along Kings Road which have been extended, and from my site visit, it was evident that there is a range of designs and sizes of properties. However, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits and there is no information before me to suggest that these examples were originally bungalows of a similar size to the appeal property. Additionally, due to the neighbouring bungalows, the alterations in scale to the appeal property would be more pronounced.
8. The appeal property has not had much attention in recent years, and whilst the principle of extending is acceptable, it is the combination of the width, depth and design which would be disproportionate to the original property with the resultant bulky and contrived form appearing visually prominent in the street scene. As such, the proposal would fail to accord with policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (DMP) and the RDG, principles 7.5 and 10.1 which amongst other things, seek high-quality design that respects and enhances the local environment, paying regard to scale, massing and roof form, and maintains the character of the area. To that end, it would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework in contributing to achieving well-designed places and being sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR