



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2024

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/24/3343760

45 Bassett Road, Maybury, Woking, Surrey GU22 8ET

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Yaroslav Zahvolskyi against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2024/0072.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension following demolition of the existing single storey side extension. Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and single storey front extension. Formation of a new vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension following demolition of the existing single storey side extension. Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and single storey front extension. Formation of a new vehicular access. at 45 Bassett Road, Maybury, Woking, Surrey GU22 8ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2024/0072, 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: B.101A, P.101A, P.104A, P.105A and P.106A
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The first floor window to the en-suite bathroom in the flank elevation of the development hereby permitted shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey brick built semi-detached house with a pitched roof and gable end. There is a good sized front garden with off street parking provision, and a long rear garden that narrows to the rear. It is located in an area of similar houses that form part of a larger planned estate. Many of these appear to have undergone some form of extension, including, variously, front side and rear extensions similar to that proposed.
4. The appeal dwelling has been the subject of a recent planning permission¹ for the creation of single storey front, side and rear extensions that have the same footprint as the extensions included in the appeal proposal. From my site visit this appears to be currently under construction. Proposals with the same ground floor footprint with additional extensions at first floor level were recently refused planning permission².
5. The appeal proposal has been put forward by the appellant in an attempt to overcome the reasons given for the refusal and to maintain much of what was acceptable or approved in these recent planning applications. As such, the appeal proposal has the same footprint as the single storey extensions previously approved, with the front extension having the same design and appearance.
6. The proposed first floor side extension, extends the existing floor plan of the existing house sideways to its full depth and replicates the gable end and existing roof form. The proposed first floor rear extension sits to the full width of the proposed side extension, aligning with the extended flank, extending across approximately half of the first floor rear elevation of the existing house and set back approximately 1.5 metres from the rear elevation of the proposed single storey part of the proposed extensions. When compared to that included in the previous refusals, the roof above the proposed first floor rear extension has been set further down from the roof ridge of the existing house and proposed side extension.
7. The extent of the proposed extensions is greater than extensions evident on houses nearby, in particular the first floor element of the rear extension is larger than similar extensions found on neighbouring dwellings. However, due to the replication of the roof ridge and gable end of the proposed side extension, the step-down to the roof of the first floor part of the proposed rear extension, which would hip with the proposed extended original roof, and the unifying design of the proposed front extension, the proposal appears more as secondary front and rear extensions to an existing terraced house.
8. As such the proposal would appear subordinate and secondary to the existing dwelling. Given the maintenance of a 1 metre separating distance to the boundary with 43 Bassett Road, the set back of the first floor part of the rear extension from the boundary with 47 Bassett road and the scale of the front and rear gardens of the appeal dwelling, the proposed extensions would not appear to overwhelm the existing dwelling or result in a cramped form of development.
9. The design of the proposal reflects the design of the original and extended houses already evident in the street and the proposed extensions would

¹ Planning Ref: PLAN/2023/0672

² Planning Ref: PLAN/2023/0456 & PLAN/2023/0177

successfully integrate with the proposal and into the character and appearance of the existing street scene. As such, the proposal would reflect and maintain the character and appearance of the local area.

10. For these reasons, the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area. There is, therefore, no conflict with design guidance set out in the Woking Design Supplementary Planning Document (2015), and the proposal would accord with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) or Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), which collectively seek development that is visually attractive as a result of good architecture and adds to the overall quality of the area in which they are situated.

Conditions

11. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council in the event of the appeal being allowed. I do not find that there are exceptional reasons that would require the removal of permitted development rights for the proposed development, and I have not included these suggested conditions.
12. Along with the standard condition for the time limit on implementation of the development, in the interests of design quality, I have included conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and the use of matching materials to existing. In the interests of privacy, I have also included a condition requiring obscured glazing.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR