The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3321767
6 Broad Street, West End, Woking Surrey GU24 9NH

- 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 Tim Speller against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
- The application Ref 23/0131/FFU, dated 6 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2023.
- The development proposed is erection of part single and part double storey side extension in dark timber cladding with rooflights, incorporated with garage conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of part single and part double storey side extension in dark timber cladding with rooflights, incorporated with garage conversion at 6 Broad Street, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9NH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/0131/FFU, dated 6 February 2023 and the plans submitted with it, 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 and documents: AL(00)00, AL(00)01, AL(00)02, AL(00)03, AL(00)04 (Existing Front Elevation), AL(00)04 (Proposed Street Scene Elevation), AL(00)05, AL(00)06, AL(00)07, AL(00)08, AL(00)09, AL(00)10, AL(00)11, AL(00)12, AL(00)14, AL(00)15, AL(00)16, AL(00)17, AL(00)18, AL(00)19, AL(00)20, and the Design and Access Statement.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Tim Speller against Surrey Heath Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. During the determination of the application, the council changed the description of development to add in the timber cladding. For accuracy, I have used the description of development on the decision notice.

Reasons

4. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

5. Broad Street is a residential street, with a suburban character. The street has a wide variety of architectural styles across bungalows and houses, being built of a variety of materials. Such is the variety that it is difficult to identify a single predominant style or character, however the variety results in a pleasing effect overall.

6. No6 is a detached two storey bay-fronted house of a traditional design, with a large front garden/driveway area and single storey attached garage. It is set further back into its plot than its neighbours at No4 and No8.

7. The appeal proposals would result in a two storey side extension which would mimic the roof pattern of the existing front elevation of the dwelling. The proposals also include a single storey, flat roof extension that would project forward of the principal elevation substantial ground floor extension.

8. The council in refusing the proposals identify the specific width and depth forward of the principal elevation that would result in offence to Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2012) (DP). Policy DM9 seeks high quality development which reinforces local character and distinctiveness.

9. Further, Principles 10.2 and 10.3 of the Residential Design Guide seek to ensure that residential extensions do not have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of an area or the adjoining properties.

10. Guideline 5 of the West End Village Design Statement 2006 (WEVDS) states that *'Extensions should be complementary to the existing building in proportion, style and use of materials.'*

11. The proposed designs are clearly more contemporary than the traditional vernacular of the house. That said, the proposals would, in my view be read as contemporary and would not 'compete' with the host dwelling.

12. The scale and massing of the proposals would not be harmful to the overall appearance of the host dwelling itself. I consider that the useful illustrative sketch view of the proposal included in the Design and Access Statement provides a representation of the completed proposals that show that the scheme would result in a more pleasing balance to the host dwelling with the addition of the two storey side extension.

13. The single storey front extension would clearly project beyond the existing principal elevation, but no further forward of the closest neighbouring dwelling at No4. Given the modest, but complementary design, I do not consider that this would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Given the considerable variety in design, materials and scale within the existing street scene, I do not agree that there would be harm resulting from the proposals to the character and appearance of the wider area.

14. Overall, I do not consider there would be offence to policy DM9 of the DP, Principles 10.2 and 10.3 of the RDG, nor to the Guideline 5 of the WEVDS.

Conclusions

15. In addition to the standard commencement condition (1), a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (2) in order to provide certainty.

16. I have not included a condition requiring materials to be approved or materials to match the existing dwelling as the facing materials and window specifications have already been shown on the plans to be approved under condition 2.

17. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR