



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3324459

5 Revesby Close, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9NT

- 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 Anna Korneva against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0120/FFU, dated 3 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey front and rear extension, including six rooflights, front porch and pitched roof over existing garage, internal alterations, alteration to external materials and fenestration changes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a more succinct description of the development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:
 - the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area; and,
 - the living conditions of occupiers of 6 Revesby Close, with particular regard to daylight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site relates to a detached bungalow in a small cul de sac with houses set back from the road edge behind paved drives and front gardens. Although house designs vary, the appeal property and neighbouring house, No 4, are similar. Both have steep pitched roofs with accommodation in the roof space. Their gable ends are clad with hanging tiles and face the road. The appeal property has an attached flat roofed garage, to the side of a central front door, which projects forward of the house. No 4 similarly projects forward to the side of its front door, but what appears to be the former garage has been converted and has a pitched roof and windows instead of a garage door.

Nonetheless, the design features shared by the two houses provide an element of symmetry within the Close which contributes to its character and appearance.

5. The proposed replacement of the flat garage roof with a pitched roof would reflect that of the projecting element on No 4. However, the proposed additional pitched roofed front extension would upset the symmetry enjoyed by the 2 houses. Also, it would project forward of the existing garage, be slightly wider, and its roof ridge would be higher than that of the proposed replacement garage roof. In combination these differences between the 2 front projections would unbalance, and thus harm, the appearance of the house, rather than providing symmetry as the appellant suggests.
6. Overall, I conclude on this main issue that the proposed development would appear incongruous and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the house and neighbouring property and therefore conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework), Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011 – 2028 (2012) (CS), Principles 7.8, 10.1 and 10.2 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) and Guideline 5 of the Village Design Statement West End Supplementary Planning Document (2013) which require high quality design that is in keeping with the existing building and street scene.

Living conditions

7. The orientation of the neighbouring house, No 6, limits access to direct sunlight to its rear and front windows in the mornings and evenings, respectively. The proposed front and rear extensions would not significantly reduce the sunlight entering those windows at these times of the day. South facing windows on No 6 face the side wall of the appeal property which has a much higher roof. Consequently, despite the gap between the houses, the appeal property already blocks direct sunlight to those windows for a substantial part of the day. The proposed rear and front extensions would be single storey and the distance between them and the neighbour's south facing windows would ensure that any further reduction in light would not be so significant as to harm the living conditions of occupants of No 6 or warrant withholding planning permission for this reason alone. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the proposed development complies with the Framework, Policy DM9 of the CS and principles 8.3, 10.1 and 10.2 of the SPD which require development to respect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR