



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/24/3356788

6 Brynford Close, Horsell, Woking GU21 4DW

- 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 P Romano against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2024/0534.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension and front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of two storey side extension and front and rear dormers at 6 Brynford Close, Horsell, Woking GU21 4DW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: PLAN/2024/0534, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall accord with the details set out under Section 10) Materials on the application forms and on approved drawing 004.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DHD-23-624B: Location Plan; DHD-23-624B: Existing Block Plan; DHD-23-624B: Proposed Block Plan; 001, 002, 003, 004.
 - 4) No site clearance, preparatory work or construction works shall commence on the development hereby permitted until the tree protection measures have been implemented in accordance with the measures set out in the 'Arboricultural Method Statement, Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan in accordance with BS:5837:2012', Refs: SO-23/1165-A and 1165-B, by South Oaks Arboricultural Consultancy and thereafter the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the information and measures set out in these reports.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council granted permission under its Ref: PLAN/2023/0906 for a ground floor extension and the proposal the subject of this appeal would be built over that extension. However, as that extension has not yet been implemented, I agree with the Council that for the avoidance of doubt and to make sure that there is no confusion between the permissions granted, it would be sensible to describe this

proposal as a two storey side extension. I have therefore used the Council's description of development. The Appellant also used this description of development at the appeal stage.

3. Planning permission has also been granted for a detached double garage following demolition of the existing garage and single storey side extension with open porch canopy under the Council's ref: PLAN/2023/0897 and has been part implemented with the erection of the detached double garage. This extension would be on the south side of the house.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised in December 2024. I do not consider that there are any material changes in the Framework, pertinent to this appeal proposal. It is not therefore necessary to seek the views of the Appellant or the Council on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and local area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached property with rooms in the roof space at the north-eastern end of a short cul-de sac of some 8 houses and within a predominantly residential area. A number of houses are of similar design and appearance but some of these have been altered and extended and three of the houses are of very different design. The appeal property benefits from a generous side garden on its northern side which abuts the entrance to another cul de sac to the north with a further four houses of different designs and materials.
7. The proposal would erect a two storey side extension to the north of the property with front and rear facing dormers. I consider that the scale and massing of the proposed extension would relate appropriately to the proportions of the existing dwelling, The modest set back of the extension, particularly from the front, together with the different eaves line, would enable the gable design of the original house to remain a prominent feature in the overall design. The fenestration would line up on the proposed extension and the main house at the front and the rear to present a co-ordinated design and appearance to the property.
8. The proposed dormers on the front and rear roof slopes would be appropriately designed and would accord with the design of existing dormers on the roof slopes of other properties within the vicinity. The flat roof element between the two dormers would help alleviate the bulk and massing of the extension and would be partly screened from view by the mature trees along the entrance to Alison Close.
9. Given the changes undertaken to some of the existing houses within Brynford Close together with the three houses of very different design, there is not in my view a clear and overriding consistency of design to the houses within the cul de sac. I am satisfied that the proposed extension, given its siting to the north of the main house and its design, including its scale and proportions would be readily assimilated and respect the character and design of the existing house as well as of the street scene.
10. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. There would be no

conflict with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), and the Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high standard of design which respects the local context.

11. The proposal would not fully accord with all the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Woking Design (2015) (SPD) and in particular on the form of the roof under Section 9D. However, I have found that the proposed development, taken as a whole, would be well designed and would respect the character and appearance of the property and of the local area, which is the objective of the SPD. In the particular circumstances of this case, I am therefore satisfied that would be justification for an exception to be made to this part of the SPD.

Other Considerations

12. There is a Tree Preservation Order, TPO/35 relating to trees at Horsell, which I have taken into account. The proposal is accompanied by a detailed arboricultural report and subject to a condition requiring compliance with its submitted information I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the protected trees in the vicinity of the site and proposed development.

Conditions

13. In terms of conditions, the materials should accord with those set out on the application forms to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area, and the approved plans should be listed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning. A condition is required to ensure that the works are carried out in accordance with all the details of the Arboricultural Method Statement submitted with the application.
14. In order to be effective, it is my view that the tree protection works require to be in place prior to any other development commencing. The condition therefore requires to be a pre-commencement condition. In accordance with Section 100ZA (5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and The Town and Country Planning (Pre-Commencement Conditions) Regulations 2018, I have therefore requested and received the Appellant's written agreement to the imposition of this condition

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR