



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/25/3358315

128 Robin Hood Road, Knaphill, Woking, Surrey, GU21 2LS

- 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 Steve Timms against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2024/0114.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing rear extension and detached garage and construction of new single-storey attached garage, side extension and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential neighbourhood and occupied by a detached, two-storey dwelling with a driveway to the side leading to a detached garage to the rear. The proposal would involve demolition of the existing garage and a small, single-storey projection to the rear of the dwelling, and the erection of an 'L-shaped', single-storey extension to the side that would project almost 5m in front of the dwelling's principal elevation, and which would wrap around part of its rear elevation, projecting to a depth of just over 4.3m.
4. The existing building is a fairly modest, mid-20th century dwelling with an almost square floor plan under a plain tiled hipped roof. It sits fairly deep behind a largely open gravelled frontage, and noticeably deeper than both neighbouring properties which have shallow frontages that are more in-keeping with the immediately prevailing pattern of development to this side of Robin Hood Road. Dwellings in the immediate area are predominantly two-storey semi-detached or detached of mixed styles and ages but of traditional pitched or hipped roof forms.
5. The *Woking Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) was adopted in 2015 with the purpose of providing design guidance and good practice to help developers, applicants, and council officers improve the quality of design in new development across the borough. It deals with residential extensions at section 9D. Amongst many other things, it states in general that any additional building mass should respect the proportions, symmetry, and balance of the existing dwelling, and

that the roof of an extension should normally be of a similar format to the existing. It recognises that front and side extensions can often have a significant impact on the character and appearance of properties and the street scene, and that garages, especially when attached, are best set back from the main building frontage.

6. I saw that many properties in the locality have benefitted from a variety of extensions and alterations. These appeared to me to have been successfully undertaken in reasonably balanced and proportionate ways, with respect for the architectural composition and form of the original dwelling and appearance of the wider area.
7. In contrast to these other examples, the proposal would add a visually dominant extension that would detract from the modest and simple appearance of the existing dwelling. Although only single storey, the extension would add significant bulk and sprawl to the building's footprint, with a deep projection to the front. Whilst this part would come no further forward than the building line of the adjacent property at No 130, and that which prevails more widely, the garage would protrude excessively and in my assessment be seen as a disproportionate adjunct, and one that would significantly disrupt the balance and traditional form of the existing dwelling.
8. The incongruous presence of the extension overall would be emphasised further by the large expanse of flat roof that would show no respect for the original hipped roof format of the dwelling. This would be readily visible from the public domain and be seen to run for a considerable length to the side of the property as an overly large and poorly related addition.
9. Overall, I find that by reason of its size, siting, excessive forward projection, and form, the extension would be a discordant addition that would appear harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene. The proposal would fail to conform with several areas of the Council's design guidance and by so doing in this instance would neither contribute positively to the street scene nor preserve the townscape quality of the area. As such there would be conflict with Policies CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy October 2012.

Other Matters

10. I have noted concerns raised by the neighbouring occupiers. The side extension to No 128 would be set away from the common side boundary with No 130. No 130 is itself set away from the same boundary. Although the extension would be deep to the rear, it would occupy space where the existing garage stands, and which is currently built immediately abutting the boundary. Furthermore, I note that the Council is satisfied that the extension would meet their '*Outlook, Amenity, Privacy & Daylight SPD*' (2008) guidance for separation distances and tests for measuring impact upon daylight and sunlight to this neighbouring property. Overall, I am satisfied that there would be no impact upon the neighbour's living conditions that would be harmful. My findings here are consistent with the Council's.
11. Any potential removal of asbestos materials from the appeal site would be controlled by other regulations.
12. The application for planning permission was made as works proposed to a dwelling. Any future material change of use that may be proposed would require a grant of planning permission.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above in relation to the main issue, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR