



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2024

by Michael J Muston BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/23/3333726

62 Courtenay Road, Woking, Surrey GU21 5HQ

- 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 Hassan Hussain against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PLAN/2023/0635, dated 26 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor extension to rear of property and first floor extension to the rear of the property. All materials to match existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:-
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 64 Courtenay Road, with particular regard to whether the development would be unacceptably overbearing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is within a densely built-up residential area. A number of properties in the area have been significantly extended, some of which are on prominent corner plots. This includes 60 Courtenay Road, which is opposite the appeal site on the other side of Delta Road, and at 181 and 183 Boundary Road, opposite each other at the far (north-western) end of Delta Road.
4. The appeal property has been extended on a number of occasions and already includes a two storey side elevation to Delta Road of considerable length, which is prominent when seen from Delta Road above the boundary fence. This existing two storey extension includes two small windows at first floor level, which are the only elements that break up an already long expanse of rendered wall.
5. The appeal proposal would involve this built form at first floor level being extended by some 6.5 metres. A further window would be added to the south-west elevation. However, the resulting two storey element of the building would be over 18 metres long, with only three small windows at irregular

intervals breaking up the length of walling along this elevation at first floor level. The extended dwelling would be very prominent when seen from Delta Road, and a combination of the length of the two storey element, and the lack of architectural detailing visible within the street scene, would make the proposed development unduly dominant, and harmful to the existing character and appearance of the area.

6. Of the existing large two storey side extensions fronting Delta Road as set out above, those at 60 Courtenay Road and 181 Boundary Road are significantly shorter than the appeal proposal. That at 183 Boundary Road is longer than the appeal proposal. However, it features more windows at first floor level, five of which are at regular intervals along the Delta Road elevation. The result is a design that fits more satisfactorily within the street scene than that proposed at the appeal site.
7. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), which says, amongst other things, that development should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated.

Living Conditions

8. The single storey element of the proposed extension would be set about 0.5 metre away from the common boundary with 64 Courtenay Road and would project some 6 metres further than the existing single storey extension. As a result, it would present a very long stretch of building within close proximity to No 64's curtilage.
9. The common boundary with No 64 alongside the proposed extension is defined by a wall approximately 1.75 metres in height. A combination of this, the set back of the extension by about 0.5 metre from that wall, and the shallow pitched roof proposed, means that the amount of the new extension that would be visible from any of No 64's rear amenity space would be limited. As a result, the proposed extension would not have an unduly overbearing impact on the occupiers of No 64.
10. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would not unduly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 64 Courtenay Road, and would comply with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) in this respect, by reason of avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of overbearing effect.

Other matters

11. The Council has suggested that the area of private garden amenity space remaining if the proposed extension were to be built would be insufficient. However, their reasons for refusal make it clear that this concern is in relation to the impact of the proposal on the character appearance of the area, which it says would be exacerbated by the insufficient amenity space. I have considered this point: however nothing I have read or seen on site persuades me that the remaining amenity space, which cannot be seen from outside the site, would exacerbate the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.

Conclusions

12. I have concluded that the proposed development would not unduly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 64 Courtenay Road. However, I have also concluded that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. This outweighs the lack of other harm. As a result, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Michael J Muston

INSPECTOR