



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2024

by Lewis Condé BSc, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/W/24/3341950

2 The Terrace, High Street, Old Woking, Woking, Surrey GU22 9ES

- 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 Z Krasniqi against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2023/0898.
 - The development proposed is erection of a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No. 2 The Terrace is a mid-terrace property comprising a ground floor commercial unit with residential use above. It forms part of a small terrace of properties that occupy a prominent position on High Street, near its corner with Shackleford Road.
4. The terrace of properties shares a hipped roof, and notwithstanding the addition of relatively small and discrete skylights, the rear roof plane appears to have largely been unaltered. The rear roof plane is largely unbroken, albeit is pierced in regular intermissions by brick chimney stacks that provide a rhythm to the terrace. Although commercial flues rise above eaves level, these do not disrupt the form of the roof.
5. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (adopted 2012) (the Core Strategy) seeks to promote the delivery of good design, through ensuring development respects and makes a positive contribution to the streetscene and the character of the area in which they are situated. This includes having regard to the scale, height and proportions and other characteristics of adjoining buildings.
6. Meanwhile, the Woking Design Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted 2015) (the SPD) contains specific guidance in relation to dormer proposals. It advises that permission will usually be granted for the installation of traditional dormer windows if they are a subordinate feature of the roofscape and are in keeping with the character of the dwelling and streetscene.
7. The proposed dormer would not be traditional in appearance, rather it would be a sizeable, flat roof box dormer that would span most of the width of the appeal property. The proposed dormer would be set down from the ridge

height and up from eaves level of the roof, whilst marginally set in from the appeal property's sides. Nevertheless, it would still have a bulky and rather dominant appearance, which would harmfully disrupt the rhythm and simple form of the roof structure for the existing terrace. My concerns regarding the scale and form of the proposed dormer would not be overcome through the proposed use of materials to match the existing roof.

8. Although located to the rear of the property, the proposed development would still be visible and highly appreciable along a fair extent of Shackleford Road, near its junction with High Street. From such vantage points, the proposal would appear as a dominant and obtrusive addition to the host property, whilst also causing detriment to the streetscene.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a sizeable dormer extension nearby at no. 9 High Street (no. 9). There are similarities between the design of that dormer and the appeal scheme. However, no.9 occupies a more inconspicuous location, with more restricted views of that development being available. Additionally, from my observations, the alterations to the roof form at no.9 was not highly characteristic of the surrounding built form, nor do I consider it a feature that should be replicated or emulated. Indeed, I understand that the development at no. 9 has a historic permission and was approved under a different policy context and prior to the Council's SPD being adopted. As such, my decision does not turn on this matter.
10. Overall, I find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Core Strategy Policy CS21, as well as the guidance of the SPD. It is also contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of promoting well designed development that is sympathetic to its surroundings.

Other Matters

11. I recognise that the design of the proposed development has evolved from a previous scheme that the Council considered, notably through a reduction in scale. Nonetheless, for reasons set out above, the proposal remains an unacceptable form of development.
12. A lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, or compliance with other development plan policies, is to be expected of new development proposals and therefore does not weigh in favour of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Lewis Condé

INSPECTOR