



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/24/3347188

83 Windsor Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8LD

- 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 Paul Taylor against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0226/FFU.
 - The development proposed a second-floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a substantial detached two storey dwelling set back from and facing the road. It has a large single span hipped roof over the main section with a single storey flat roofed attached garage to the side. The frontage is evenly balanced with smaller windows to the first floor and a centralised entrance, presenting a pleasant and rhythmic traditionality to the street scene. In the wider sense, this is eclectic with dwellings of different designs, ages, materials and degrees of setback.
 5. The proposal would leave a small area of flat roof over the garage creating an unbalanced, disjointed appearance which would poorly relate to the design of the house as a whole. In addition, the three dormer windows would be positioned tightly together, taking up most of the contextually short run of roofscape. They would, as a result, appear cramped and at odds with the quality of the symmetry of the house's existing fenestration.
 6. The position of the appeal building opposite a junction would exacerbate the obviousness of these matters. There are some trees which would provide some screening but not such that would conceal the height of the extension. With this and the above in mind, the extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
-

7. The street scene is a spacious one in places and there is a clear verdant hinterland to the surrounding area. Some glimpses of it are available over the existing garage. The extension would not expand the land take of the appeal building and first floor openness would remain obvious to its right, across the neighbouring plot, when viewed from the street. The street scene is clearly an urban one and relatively densely developed. There would remain a substantial open space opposite.
8. Dormers are far from an alien feature locally. They are however mostly sets of two which are, by their nature, more spaced out and don't clutter their roof. Of the examples of three abreast referred to, they don't appear to dominate their roof in as sufficiently the same a way as the appeal scheme, sitting as they do in a markedly different context. They do not therefore justify the proposed development.
9. With this and the above in mind, the proposals would conflict with Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 insofar as it requires development that respects and enhances local character. They would not meet the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide SPD 2017 which, amongst other things, explains that architectural design which would not positively contribute to the character and quality of the area will be resisted. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to resist development of poor design amongst other things.

Other Matters

10. Whilst it is evident some work has been done to address neighbour concerns with a previous design, this does not absolve me from making an assessment as to the effect of the current scheme on the character and appearance of the area. The benefit of providing extra accommodation in the extended dwelling would be a private one and thus worthy of only limited weight. In terms of concerns about the Council's handling of the planning application, this is a matter that should be taken up with them directly and not for me to resolve in this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that justify granting planning permission other than in accordance therewith. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR