



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3655/D/23/3327088

10 Langmans Way, Woking, Surrey GU21 3QY

- 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 Katrina Carrigy against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2023/0058, dated 19 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is a shed in front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a shed in front garden at 10 Langmans Way, Woking, Surrey GU21 3QY in accordance with the terms of the application, PLAN/2023/0058, dated 19 January 2023 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The shed is in situ and therefore this is a retrospective proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Langmans Way is part of Goldsworld Park, a purpose-built 1970/1980s housing estate comprising properties of a similar design and materials, interspersed with communal parking areas, open space, and mature trees. No.10 is located at the end of a terraced row which is set back from the road with parking spaces in front. Each property within the row has a modest front garden which is defined by low boundary treatments. In addition, No.10 has an extended area to the side, which is defined by the high boundary walls to the rear garden of the appeal property and that of No.12, which is part of a terraced row sited perpendicular to the appeal property. As such, while the shed is in a forward position it does not project in front of the house and is screened by the neighbouring terrace in views from the south.
5. The front gardens of properties in the area are generally open. They are however used to accommodate residential paraphernalia such as bins and within the terraced row, Nos.2-10, there are two other properties with storage structures to the front, albeit smaller in scale. Additionally, the layout and orientation of properties within the estate vary, and as a result, higher

boundary treatments to rear gardens and glimpses of structures within them are also visible from the public domain.

6. The appeal structure has a typical shed appearance and does contrast with the brickwork of the property. Staining the shed a darker colour would aid integration, but, in my view, it is not a markedly alien form or material within a residential setting. I do however accept that the siting of these types of structures to the front of a property is unusual, and a proliferation of such development could be detrimental to the character and appearance of the planned estate. Nonetheless, in this instance, due to the limited scale of the development which aligns with the height of the boundary wall behind and its corner location, the specific relationship with the surrounding area is such that I do not find that it is highly prominent in the street scene or visually obtrusive to the host property.
7. I therefore conclude on balance, that the development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the area and overall would accord with policies CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy and the aims of the Woking Design - Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for development to respect the character of the area.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out the appeal is allowed. As the shed is already in place no conditions are necessary.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR