



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by H Miles BA (hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/24/3351046

7 Foxlake Road, Byfleet, West Byfleet, Surrey KT14 7PW

- 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 James Clarke against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2024/0275.
 - The development proposed is erection of front and rear dormer windows, insertion of side window and front rooflight
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice as this accurately and clearly describes the act of development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the front dormer.

Reasons

4. Foxlake Road is characterised by semi detached bungalows which have pitched roofs and projecting front wings. Originally, they had hipped roofs, although many now have hip to gable extensions and rear dormers and these now form part of the character and appearance of the area. This finding is in common with a recent appeal decision elsewhere in this road¹. However, there are very few front dormers. Those at 16, 21 and 24 have been drawn to my attention although these are further along the road than the appeal site, appear smaller than that proposed and moreover are not so common as to form an overriding part of the character and appearance of this area. Whilst the detailing is not identical between properties along Foxlake Road, nevertheless, the single storey scale and form of the pitched roof to the front elevations remains prominent and results in a clearly apparent and attractive sense of uniformity to this streetscene.
5. The roof form at 7 Foxlake Road has not been extended and it retains a hipped pitched roofslope and projecting wing. This makes a positive contribution to the characteristics of the area described above.

¹ APP/A3655/D/23/3320778

6. The proposed development would introduce a large front dormer to this property. It would occupy around half of the width of the front roofslope and extend from close to the ridge to just above the eaves.
7. The size and scale of the dormer proposed would result in a bulky addition to the roofslope. Furthermore, its position to the front elevation would be highly prominent in the streetscene. Consequently, the proposed front dormer would conspicuously erode the attractive sense of uniformity along Foxlake Road and would be harmfully dominant. It is clear that I agree with the Council officers' professional judgement on this matter for these specific reasons.
8. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) (CS) sets out a number of bullet points relating to the design of new development and Policy CS24 of the CS includes five bullet points relating to landscape and townscape. Whilst the proposal would not be contrary to many of these, nevertheless it would not create a building or place that is attractive and would not respect and make a positive contribution to the streetscene and the character of the area in which it is situated. Nor would it conserve townscape character. Therefore, it would be contrary to these policies. In addition, it would not be in accordance with the advice in the Woking Design SPD (2105) (SPD) which states that dormers should be a subordinate feature of the roofscape and be in keeping with the character of the dwelling and street scene.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the front dormer. Therefore, in this respect, it would be contrary to policies CS21 and CS24 of the CS as set out above.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR