
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/23/3319875

Shipley House, 47 Woodham Road, Horsell, Woking, Surrey, GU21 4EH

- 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 A Murrin against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2022/1113, dated 2 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension to the existing garage to create a secured cycle store and upward extension of the garage to create home office/storage space with the new pitched roof, dormer windows and external timber staircase.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Shipley House is a large detached house set in a large plot on the corner of Woodham Road and Carlton Road with vehicular access to both roads. It has a detached double garage and a detached timber double carport on either side of the Carlton Road access on the northeast side of the plot and some outbuildings and other structures in the garden area to the west and south of the house. The area is characterised by large detached houses set back from the road with extensive mature vegetation including hedging and several protected trees. These give the area a spacious, landscaped appearance.
4. I consider that the relevant policies in this case include CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 (the Core Strategy) and DM2 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2016 (the DMPDPD). These relate to the design of development, protection of the landscape and trees and development on garden land. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Design* 2015 (the SPD) contains additional detailed guidance on aspects of design, including scale, streetscape and building lines.
5. The existing garage has a low profile and is screened from Woodham Road by dense evergreen hedging and from Carlton Road by timber fencing and a number of trees. The proposed addition of an upper floor with a higher,

steeply pitched roof and two dormer windows on each side would result in a significant increase in the bulk, scale and overall size of the building.

6. I consider that this increase would fail to respect the character of the area because of the prominent position of the building on the corner and in front of the general building line along Carlton Road. Although it would be partially screened by hedges and trees, it would appear prominent in views from Woodham Road and Carlton Road and would not be in keeping with the street scene in Carlton Road.
7. The appellant refers to a number of garages along Woodham Road. These are large and prominent and on the opposite side of the road to No. 47. The circumstances of each are similar in some respects to the appeal property, but differ sufficiently in siting and history to limit their relevance to the appeal proposal. Three of them were permitted before the adoption of the Core Strategy and the DMPDPD, and the fourth was permitted before the adoption of the DMPDPD. They also pre-date the SPD. These policies and guidance are clear in their requirements for development to respect the character of the area and have regard to matters such as scale, height and building line.
8. The proposal would appear particularly prominent and out of keeping in the context of Carlton Road, which I consider has a different character from that of Woodham Road, in that it forms the boundary with the extensive woodland area of Horsell Common and has a semi-rural appearance marking the transition from the woodland to the residential area along Woodham Road. The houses in Carlton Road are only along the western side and, although not set on a strictly formal building line, are set approximately 12-14 metres back from the road along a loose building line with front gardens laid variously to hardstanding, gravel and grass and with mature hedges and trees providing partial screening. There are no detached garages or other outbuildings in the front gardens and the proposal would be at odds with that pattern of development and the wider landscape.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to Core Strategy policies CS21 and CS24 and DMPDPD policy DM10.
10. The appellant supplied insufficient information with the application to allow the Council to assess the impact the proposal would have on the trees within and near the site which are subject to Tree Protection Orders. The appellant has submitted an Arboricultural Report with the appeal which relates to these trees. Although it is likely that this would be sufficient to support the application, the Council has not had the opportunity to carry out the necessary consultation and to assess the potential impact of the development on the trees.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal is in conflict with the requirements of DMPDPD policy DM2 which requires the adequate protection of trees affected by new development.
12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR