



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2025

by **N Perrins MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/24/3356198

62 Gloster Road, Old Woking, Woking, Surrey GU22 9EX

- 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 Robert Holmes against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2024/0670.
 - The proposed development is the erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing lean to structure. Insertion of side window and sun tunnels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024. The updated Framework does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. To the rear of the property is an irregular shaped garden area. An existing ground floor lean-to has been erected off the back of the property that provides a covered area of outside amenity space. The character of the area is residential with properties having mainly open rear gardens. Some properties, including the appeal site, have erected outbuildings in their rear garden area.
5. The proposal comprises the erection of a part two-storey and part single-storey rear extension. It would replace the existing rear ground floor lean-to structure and incorporate what is currently outdoor space within the proposed extension. I understand that the proposal follows an earlier refusal Ref: PLAN/2024/0284 for a larger rear extension. I agree with the conclusions reached in the Council Officer's Report that the appeal proposal before me has adequately addressed the previous concerns regarding the impact on the character of the host dwelling and

surrounding area. The sole remaining matter in dispute is, therefore, the appeal proposal's impact on the provision of outdoor amenity space for the property.

6. The Council's Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight Supplementary Planning Document 2022 (SPD) advises that dwellings with two or more bedrooms and a gross floor area between 70-150sqm should have private garden amenity space in scale with the building but generally no smaller than the building footprint of the house depending on existing context.
7. From the information before me the proposed development would result in a dwelling with a footprint of around 73.4sqm and a rear garden of around 24sqm. The amount of outdoor space would also be reduced from the existing situation given that it is proposed to incorporate the existing outdoor lean-to amenity area to within the extended dwelling.
8. The rear garden amenity space that would remain would be significantly below the Council's guidance as set out in its SPD. The main issue with the amount of outdoor amenity space that can be provided at the property is the outbuilding located to the rear of the garden area. This removes a significant proportion of the rear garden from being used as outdoor amenity space. As I observed on my site inspection, the remaining area of land that is available for outdoor space would be a comparatively condensed section in the middle part of the garden.
9. This would be disproportionately and uncharacteristically small when considering the footprint of the proposed extended dwelling as well the prevailing character of the area and amount of private amenity space that is generally provided for family dwellings. As such, the proposal would result in a deficient amount of rear private amenity space for the property that would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of occupiers of the property contrary to the requirements of the SPD.
10. I note the appellant has drawn comparisons to other extensions that have been approved in the area including at No. 20 Gloster Road. However, from the limited information provided it is not clear whether the site circumstances for other extensions nearby are in any way the same as in this case. As I must determine this appeal on its own merits, the information provided regarding extensions elsewhere does not provide justification for the harm identified.
11. To conclude, the proposed extension is contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 and the guidance within the SPD that seek to ensure that development provides appropriate levels of private amenity space. The proposal would also be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which requires development to create places that promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the development is not consistent with the policies of the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would lead me to a different conclusion. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR